arXiv:math/0612094v2 [math.PR] 13 Nov 2009

Hydrodynamics and hydrostatics for a class of asymmetric particle systems with open boundaries

C. Bahadoran *

Abstract

We consider multidimensional attractive particle systems with product invariant measures and open boundaries. We show that the Euler hydrodynamic limit is a scalar conservation law with boundary conditions of Bardos, Leroux and Nédélec. The stationary profile between parallel hyperplanes follows by proving asymptotic stability of entropy solutions. Examples include fluxes with several minima and maxima.

AMS 2000 subject classifications. 60K35, 82C22, 82C26; 35L65, 35L67, 35L50.

Key words and phrases. Asymmetric particle system with open boundaries; hydrodynamics and hydrostatics; boundary-driven phase transition; scalar conservation law; entropy solution; BLN boundary condition.

1 Introduction

Stochastic lattice gases in contact with reservoirs are relatively tractable and thus widely studied examples of nonequilibrium stationary states. The derivation of the stationary macroscopic profile (hydrostatic limit) is a natural problem in this context. For diffusive bulk dynamics, robust methods (see

*Laboratoire de Mathématiques, Université Clermont-Ferrand 2, F-63177 Aubière. e-mail: Christophe.Bahadoran@math.univ-bpclermont.fr

e.g. [22, 23, 37, 48]) show that the hydrostatic profile is the stationary solution to the hydrodynamic equation (a possibly nonlinear diffusion equation) with Dirichlet boundary conditions imposed by the reservoir densities. For driven lattice gases, no general approach is available. The one-dimensional asymmetric exclusion process was addressed in [16] and [45, 46] by model-specific methods. The hydrostatic profile consists of three uniform phases outside the phase transition line $\lambda_l < \lambda_r$, $\lambda_l + \lambda_r = 1$, where λ_l and λ_r denote the density of the left and right reservoir. On the phase transition line it consists of a randomly located shock connecting λ_l and λ_r. In both cases this profile is a stationary solution to the hydrodynamic equation, now of hyperbolic type:

$$\partial_t \rho(t,x) + \nabla_x . f(\rho(t,x)) = 0 \tag{1}$$

with the current-density function given by $f(\rho) = \rho(1-\rho)$. However, outside phase transition, it cannot satisfy Dirichlet boundary conditions at both ends. In this paper we provide the proper interpretation of the hydrostatic profile in terms of boundary conditions and use this new point of view to rigorously extend the results of [16] and [45, 46] to more general driven particle systems and higher dimensions. In [54], a variational formula was introduced heuristically for the bulk density of one-dimensional driven lattice systems with open boundaries, governed by a hydrodynamic equation of the form (1). When the current $f(\rho)$ exhibits two local maxima with a local minimum inbetween (as in the KLS model, see [38]), this gives rise to a seven-phase diagram. There is so far no mathematical proof of this result, nor any attempt to generalize it to higher space dimension. We establish such results for a wide class of models as a consequence of the hydrodynamic limit.

The hydrodynamic behavior of particle systems with open boudaries is so far understood in diffusive regimes ([23, 48, 9]), but not in Euler scaling, due to the specific nature of the boundary conditions for (1). We prove here that the Euler hydrodynamic limit is the entropy solution to an initial-boundary problem for (1) with the BLN boundary conditions introduced in [7], that are relevant for hyperbolic conservation laws. Instead of fixing the boundary value like Dirichlet conditions, these conditions impose a set of possible boundary values depending on the boundary datum ([19]). Our result is established for attractive particle systems on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with product invariant measures, that is in framework of the celebrated paper [55], which proved that the hydrodynamic limit on the whole space was the entropy solution to (1).

Here we restrict particles to the lattice discretization of a regular open subset Ω of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Boundary dynamics are defined to model exchanges of particles with a reservoir of given density profile $\hat{\lambda}(.) \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$. Our proof uses a generalized formulation ([64]) of the BLN boundary conditions that does not explicitely involve a trace for the solution. Producing this formulation from the microscopic boundary dynamics involves adequate coupling of open systems. We next derive the hydrostatic profile and local equilibrium in a domain Ω between two parallel hyperplanes coupled to uniform reservoirs. The result is a d-dimensional version of [54], and holds more generally between perturbed hyperplanes away from the perturbation. Other geometries could be tractable by our method and induce a new type of phase diagrams: we hope to obtain rigorous results in further work ([6]). The hydrostatic limit is derived from the hydrodynamic limit after proving a large-time convergence theorem for entropy solutions with BLN boundary conditions. The latter problem has been studied only for fluxes that are convex ([49]) or with a single maximum ([50]). By comparison and entropy dissipation arguments we treat general fluxes.

It would be interesting to treat other models with a hydrodynamic limit of the form (1). These include systems with a microscopic Lax-Hopf formula, e.g. the totally asymmetric K-exclusion process([58]); attractive systems with non-explicit invariant measures ([56],[5]); KLS and other nearest-particle models ([38],[15],[2],[3]); weakly asymmetric systems with vanishing viscosity ([25]–[28]). Boundary extension of the Lax-Hopf formula ([35]) could be sought for K-exclusion process and related models. For the models in [58, 56, 5], invariant measures are not explicit, and not even known to exist for all densities. One is led to define simple boundary mechanisms that are not related to invariant measures. In [31] this was conjectured to induce a non-explicit effective boundary density. We believe that the hydrodynamic limit would still given by BLN conditions for this effective boundary density.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we define the framework, state results, and give examples. The hydrodynamic limit (Theorem 2.1) is established in Section 3, the hydrostatic limit (Theorem 2.3) in Section 4, and large-time convergence of entropy solutions (Theorem 2.2) in Section 5.

2 The framework and results

Notation. Let $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \{0, 1, \ldots\}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta > 0$, $|x| = \max_{i=1,\ldots,d} |x_i|$, $x \wedge y = \min(x, y)$, $x \vee y = \max(x, y)$, $x^+ = x \vee 0$, $x^- = -(x \wedge 0)$, $B_\delta(x) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : |z - x| \leq \delta\}$. $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$ denotes the $(d-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$. $\mathbb{E} := E^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is the set of particle configurations $\eta = (\eta(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$, where $E = [0, \mathcal{K}] \cap \mathbb{Z}^+$, and $\mathcal{K} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is the maximum number of particles per site. A local (or cylinder) function f on $\mathbb{E}$ is a function that depends only on the restriction of η to a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. The partial product order on $\mathbb{E}$, i.e. $\eta \leq \xi$ iff. $\eta(x) \leq \xi(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, induces (see e.g. [59, 44]) a partial stochastic order among probability measures on $\mathbb{E}$: for two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 on $\mathbb{E}$, $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ iff., equivalently: (a) For every nondecreasing function f on $\mathbf{X}$, $\int f d\mu_1 \leq \int f d\mu_2$; (b) There exists a probability measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on $\mathbf{X}^2$, with marginals μ_1 and μ_2, supported on $\{(\eta_1, \eta_2) \in \mathbb{E}^2 : \eta_1 \leq \eta_2\}$. Spatial shift on $\mathbb{E}$, defined by $\tau_x \eta(.) = \eta(x + .)$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is extended to functions $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{E}}$ by $\tau_x f = f \circ \tau_x$, and to operators L on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{E}}$ by $\tau_x L = L \circ \tau_x$.

Framework. We consider particle systems on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ (i.e. Feller processes on $\mathbb{E}$, with generator denoted by L and semigroup denoted by $(e^{tL}, t \geq 0)$) with the following properties - see examples in Subsection 2.2: (a) local and translation invariant dynamics, i.e.

$$L = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} L_x, \quad L_x = \tau_x L_0 \tau_{-x} \tag{2}$$

where L_0 is a bounded Markov generator acting only on $B_r(0) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ (boundedness is not essential and could be replaced by a linear growth assumption on jump rates as in [1]); b) conservation of particles:

$$L_0 \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |x| \leq r} \eta(x) = 0 \tag{3}$$

with a bounded number of displaced particles, see (62); (c) existence of a local monotone coupling (which implies attractiveness, see [44]); (d) an exponential family of product invariant measures $(\nu_\rho)_{\rho \in \mathcal{R}}$ on $\mathbb{E}$, indexed by the mean particle density, $\rho = \nu_\rho[\eta(0)] \in \mathcal{R} := [0, \mathcal{K}] \cap [0, +\infty)$; by exponential we mean (this is in fact a consequence of (3) given (2)), for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$\nu_\rho(\eta(0) = n) = \nu_{\rho_0}(\eta(0) = n) \exp\{[\beta(\rho) - \beta(\rho_0)]n - [\Lambda(\beta(\rho)) - \Lambda(\beta(\rho_0))]\}$$

for $\rho, \rho_0 \in \mathcal{R}\backslash\{0, \mathcal{K}\}$,where $\beta(.)$ is a C^∞-diffeomorphism from $\mathcal{R}\backslash\{0, \mathcal{K}\}$ to $(-\infty, \beta_0)$; (e) irreducibility assumptions (see Subsection 2.2). Let now particles evolve in $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$. On the reservoir $\mathbb{Z}^d\backslash S$, we have a microscopic profile $\lambda(.)$, that is a bounded $\mathcal{R}$-valued field. We construct a Markov generator $L_{S,\lambda(.)}$ on E^S as follows. We decompose a particle configuration on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $\eta \in \mathbb{E}$, as $\eta = \eta^\circ \oplus \overline{\eta}$, where $\eta^\circ \in E^S$ is its restriction to S, and $\overline{\eta} \in E^{\mathbb{Z}^d\backslash S}$ its restriction to $\mathbb{Z}^d\backslash S$. If η is a $\mathbb{E}$-valued r.v. with distribution μ, μ° denotes the distribution of η°. μ°, ν°, etc., also denote probability distributions defined directly on E^S. Let the reservoir state be the product measure $\overline{\nu}_{S,\lambda(.)}$ on $E^{\mathbb{Z}^d\backslash S}$ such that

$$\overline{\nu}_{S,\lambda(.)}(\{\overline{\eta}(x) = n\}) = \theta_{\lambda(x)}(n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\backslash S, \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \tag{4}$$

We set, for every local function $\eta^\circ \mapsto f(\eta^\circ)$ on E^S,

$$L_{S,\lambda(.)}f(\eta^\circ) = \int Lf(\eta^\circ \oplus \overline{\eta}) d\overline{\nu}_{S,\lambda(.)}(\overline{\eta}) \tag{5}$$

where Lf depends on $\overline{\eta}$ because of x near the boundary in (2). (5) implies

$$L_{S,\lambda(.)} = \sum_{x \in S^{r\circ}} L_x + \sum_{x \in \partial S^r} L_x^{S,\lambda(.)} \tag{6}$$

where generators $L_x^{S,\lambda(.)}$ contain bulk-reservoir interactions, and, for $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
S^{\delta\circ} &:= \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d(x, \mathbb{Z}^d\backslash S) > \delta\right\} && (7)\\
\partial S^\delta &:= \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d(x, S) \le \delta,\, d(x, \mathbb{Z}^d\backslash S) \le \delta\right\} && (8)\\
\partial S^{\delta+} &:= \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d(x, S) \le \delta\right\} && (9)\\
d(x, S) &:= \inf\{|x - y| : y \in S\} && (10)
\end{aligned}$$

A natural property of (5) is that a system in equilibrium remains so when in contact with a reservoir of equal density:

Proposition 2.1 *If $\lambda(.) \equiv \rho$, ν_ρ° is invariant for $L_{S,\lambda(.)}$.*

Indeed: by (5) and invariance of ν_ρ for L, for a local function $f(\eta^\circ)$ on E^S,

$$\int L_{S,\lambda(.)}f(\eta^\circ) d\nu_\rho^\circ(\eta^\circ) = \int Lf(\eta^\circ \oplus \overline{\eta}) d\nu_\rho(\eta^\circ \oplus \overline{\eta}) = 0$$

2.1 Results

Hydrodynamic limit. Let $S = \Omega_N := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : x/N \in \Omega\}$, where Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with a boundary of locally finite perimeter ([18]), and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ a scaling parameter. Set $\mathbb{E}_N^\circ := E^{\Omega_N}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{E}}_N = E^{\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Omega_N}$. We say a uniformly bounded sequence $(\lambda_N(.),\, N \in \mathbb{N})$ of microscopic reservoir profiles on $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \Omega_N$ has limiting trace $\hat{\lambda}(.) \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ (the macroscopic reservoir profile) on $\partial\Omega$, and we write $\lambda_N(.) \sim \hat{\lambda}(.)$, if for some $C > 0$,

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} N^{1-d} \sum_{x \in \partial\Omega_N^{2r+}} \varphi(x/N) f(\lambda_N(x)) \le C \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi(x) f(\hat{\lambda}(x))\, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \quad (11)$$

for every nonnegative continuous functions f on $\mathcal{R}$ and φ with compact support on $\mathbb{R}^d$. (11) holds for instance if $\lambda_N(x) = \lambda(x/N)$, where $\lambda(.)$ a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$ with trace $\hat{\lambda}(.)$ on $\partial\Omega$. To every configuration η°, we associate a sequence of empirical measures on Ω:

$$\alpha^N(\eta^\circ)(dx) = N^{-1} \sum_{y \in \Omega_N} \eta^\circ(y) \delta_{\frac{y}{N}}(dx), \quad N \in \mathbb{N} \quad (12)$$

Let $\mu^{N\circ}$ be, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, a probability measure on $\mathbb{E}_N^\circ$. We say the sequence $(\mu^{N\circ})_N$ has density profile $\rho(.) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, if under $\mu^{N\circ}$ the random measures $\alpha^N(\eta^\circ)(dx)$ converge in probability as $N \to \infty$ to $\rho(.)dx$ with respect to vague topology (i.e. against continuous test functions with compact support in Ω). We write $\mu^{N\circ} \sim \rho(.)$ if

$$\mu^{N\circ}(d\eta) = \bigotimes_{x \in \Omega_N} \nu_{\rho^N(x)}(d\eta^\circ(x)) \quad (13)$$

for some uniformly bounded family $(\rho^N(x),\, N \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \Omega_N)$ such that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \int_I \left|\rho^N([Nx]) - \rho(x)\right| dx = 0 \quad (14)$$

for every bounded Borel set $I \subset \Omega$. Define

$$j(\eta) = L_0 \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d :\, |x| \le r} x\eta(x), \quad h(\rho) := \int_{\mathbb{E}} j(\eta) \nu_\rho(d\eta) \quad (15)$$

(the microscopic and macroscopic flux). $h \in C^1(\mathcal{R})$ because (ν_ρ) is exponential. Consider the scalar conservation law.

$$\partial_t \rho(t,x) + \mathrm{div}_x h(\rho(t,x)) = 0 \quad (16)$$

Theorem 2.1 *Assume $\mu^{N\circ} \sim \rho_0(.) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\lambda_N(.) \sim \hat{\lambda}(.) \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$. Then, for every $t > 0$, $\mu_{Nt}^{N\circ} := \mu^{N\circ} e^{NtL_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.)}}$ has density profile $\rho(t,.)$, where $\rho(.,.)$ is the unique entropy solution to (16) in Ω with initial datum $\rho_0(.)$ and boundary datum $\hat{\lambda}(.)$.*

Following [64], we say $\rho(.) \in L^\infty((0,+\infty)\times\Omega)$ is an entropy solution to (16) in Ω, with data $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\hat{\lambda} \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$, iff. there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{(0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d} [\partial_t\varphi(t,x)\phi(\rho(t,x)) + \nabla_x\varphi(t,x).\psi(\rho(t,x))]\,dtdx \\ + \quad & M\int_{(0,+\infty)\times\partial\Omega} \varphi(t,x)\phi(\hat{\lambda}(x))dt\,d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) + \int_\Omega \varphi(0,x)\phi(\rho_0(x))dx \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for every nonnegative smooth function φ with compact support in $[0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d$, and the Kružkov entropy-flux pairs ([39]) $(\phi,\psi) = (\phi_c^\pm, \psi_c^\pm)$ given by

$$\begin{array}{l} \phi_c^+(\rho) = (\rho - c)^+,\ \psi_c^+(\rho) = 1_{(0,+\infty)}(\rho - c)[h(\rho) - h(c)] \\ \phi_c^-(\rho) = (\rho - c)^-,\ \psi_c^-(\rho) = -1_{(-\infty,0)}(\rho - c)[h(\rho) - h(c)] \end{array} \tag{18}$$

Existence and uniqueness of an entropy solution are proved in [64]. The original and equivalent definition of the entropy solution in [7] (see also [19]) separately imposes (i) the classical Kružkov's entropy conditions in Ω: i.e., (17) without the boundary term, for smooth φ with compact support in $[0,+\infty)\times\Omega$ (here entropies $\phi_c := \phi_c^+ + \phi_c^-$ would be sufficient); (ii) the BLN boundary condition

$$\hat{\rho}(t,x) \in \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\lambda}(x)}^{h(.).n(x)}, \quad dt\otimes\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dx)\text{-a.e. on } (0,+\infty)\times\partial\Omega \tag{19}$$

where $n(x)$ is the inner unitary normal to $\partial\Omega$, $\hat{\rho}(t,x)$ the trace of $\rho(.,.)$, and

$$\mathcal{E}_\lambda^{f(.)} := \{\rho\in\mathcal{R} :\ \mathrm{sgn}\,(\rho-\lambda)[f(\rho)-f(c)] \leq 0,\ \forall c \in [\min(\lambda,\rho),\max(\lambda,\rho)]\} \tag{20}$$

is the set of admissible boundary values for a scalar flux function $f(.)$ on $\mathcal{R}$ and a density value $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}$. Entropy conditions in Ω ensure existence of a trace in sufficient sense to make (19) meaningful (see [62, 40, 53]).

Hydrostatic limit and stationary entropy solutions. Let $n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a unitary vector and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a < b$. We assume now that Ω is a "perturbation" of

$$\Omega_{a,b}^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d :\ n.x \in (a,b)\} \tag{21}$$

in the following sense: there exist $-\infty < a' \leq a < b \leq b' < +\infty$ such that

$$\Omega^n_{a,b} \subset \Omega \subset \Omega^n_{a',b'} \tag{22}$$

The boundary of Ω is a disjoint union of components $\partial\Omega_\gamma$ for $\gamma \in \{a, b\}$, such that $n.x \leq a$ (resp. $n.x \geq b$) on $\partial\Omega_a$ (resp. on $\partial\Omega_b$). If $\Omega = \Omega^n_{a,b}$, $\partial\Omega_\gamma$ is the hyperplane $\{n.x = \gamma\}$. We consider (16) in Ω with BLN boundary datum

$$\hat{\lambda}(.) = \lambda_a 1_{\partial\Omega_a} + \lambda_b 1_{\partial\Omega_b} \tag{23}$$

on $\partial\Omega$, where $(\lambda_a, \lambda_b) \in \mathcal{R}^2$. For a scalar flux function $f \in C^1(\mathcal{R})$, define

$$\lambda^f_a = \inf\{\lambda \leq \lambda_a : f \text{ is constant on } [\lambda, \lambda_a]\} \tag{24}$$
$$\lambda^f_b = \sup\{\lambda \geq \lambda_b : f \text{ is constant on } [\lambda_b, \lambda]\} \tag{25}$$

if $\lambda_a \leq \lambda_b$, or

$$\lambda^f_a = \sup\{\lambda \geq \lambda_a : f \text{ is constant on } [\lambda_a, \lambda]\} \tag{26}$$
$$\lambda^f_b = \inf\{\lambda \leq \lambda_b : f \text{ is constant on } [\lambda, \lambda_b]\} \tag{27}$$

if $\lambda_a \geq \lambda_b$. For $\lambda_a \leq \lambda_b$ (resp. $\lambda_a \geq \lambda_b$), let $\mathcal{M}_f(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ denote the set of minimizers (resp. maximizers) of f on $[\lambda^f_a \wedge \lambda^f_b, \lambda^f_a \vee \lambda^f_b]$, and $R_f(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ its unique element when $\mathcal{M}_f(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ is a singleton.

Theorem 2.2 *Assume $h \in C^1(\mathcal{R})$, and $\mathcal{M}_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b) = \{R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)\}$. Then, any entropy solution to (16) in Ω with boundary datum (23) on $\partial\Omega$ converges as $t \to \infty$ to $R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega^n_{a,b})$, and any stationary entropy solution $\rho_0(.) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is equal to $R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ in $\Omega^n_{a,b}$. In particular for $\Omega = \Omega^n_{a,b}$, any entropy solution converges to the unique stationary solution $R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$.*

Remark. (i) The singleton condition is necessary for uniqueness of a stationary solution in $\Omega^n_{a,b}$. Otherwise, one can construct stationary solutions by connecting any sequence of increasing (decreasing) minimizers (maximizers) across hyperplanes parallel to the boundaries; in dimension one, these are the only stationary solutions. (ii) For h of the form (15) in the framework of Section 2, $h(.).n$ is not constant on any nontrivial interval unless it vanishes on $\mathcal{R}$. Then, given $n \in \mathbb{R}^d$: either $\mathcal{M}_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b) = \{R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)\}$, $\lambda^f_a = \lambda_a$ and $\lambda^f_b = \lambda_b$ for all (λ_a, λ_b); or $\mathcal{M}_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ is a singleton for no (λ_a, λ_b) (e.g. for the exclusion process with hyperplanes parallel to the drift, boundaries cannot determine inside density).

Theorem 2.3 *Assume* $\lambda_N(.) \sim \hat{\lambda}(.) \in L^\infty(\partial\Omega)$, $\mathcal{M}_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b) = \{R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)\}$, *and* $\nu^{N\circ}$ *is an invariant measures for* $L_{\Omega_N, \lambda_N(.)}$ *satisfying*

$$\text{There exists } R \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \quad \forall N \geq N_0,\ \nu^{N\circ} \leq \nu_R^\circ \tag{28}$$

Then, as $N \to \infty$*: (i) the restriction to* $\Omega_{a,b}^n$ *of* $\alpha^N(\eta^\circ)$ *defined by (12) has uniform density profile* $R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ *(hydrostatic limit); (ii) for every bounded local function* g *on* $\mathbb{E}$, $\overline{g}^N(x) := \tau_{[Nx]}\nu^N[g(\eta^\circ)]$ *converges in* $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega_{a,b}^n)$ *to* $\overline{g} := \nu_{R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a,\lambda_b)}[g(\eta^\circ)]$ *(local equilibrium).*

Remarks. (28) is a microscopic counterpart of $\rho_s(.) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ in Theorem 2.2. If $\mathcal{K} < +\infty$, it is always satisfied by $R = \mathcal{K}$. If $\mathcal{K} = +\infty$, there exists a sequence of invariant measures satisfying (28) with $R = \max(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$. Indeed, by Corollary 3.1, $M_t^N := t^{-1}\int_0^t \mu^N e^{sL_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.)}} ds \leq \nu_R^\circ$. Thus $(M_t^N,\ t \geq 0)$ is tight, and one can pick any subsequential limit $\nu^{N\circ}$ as $t \to \infty$. In particular, (28) is satisfied if the invariant measure is unique for N large enough, which holds regardless of $\mathcal{K}$ in dimension one.

2.2 Examples

In the following examples, $\Omega_N = \{1, \ldots, N-1\}$, $\Omega = (0,1)$, $\partial\Omega = \{0,1\}$, $\lambda_N(.) = \lambda_a 1_{\mathbb{Z}\cap(-\infty,1)} + \lambda_b 1_{\mathbb{Z}\cap(N-1,+\infty)}$, $\hat{\lambda}(.) = \lambda_a 1_{\{0\}} + \lambda_b 1_{\{1\}}$, where $\lambda_a, \lambda_b \in \mathcal{R}$ are given reservoir densities. For $\eta \in \mathbb{E}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \neq y$: $\delta_{x,y}\eta$ is $\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y$ if $\eta(x) > 0$ and $\eta(y) < \mathcal{K}$, η otherwise; $\delta_x^+\eta$ is $\eta + \delta_x$ is $\eta(x) < \mathcal{K}$, η otherwise; $\delta_x^-\eta$ is $\eta - \delta_x$ if $\eta(x) > 0$, η otherwise; $\sigma_{x,y}\eta$ exchanges contents of sites x and y. If $\gamma \in \{\delta_{x,y}, \delta_x^\pm, \sigma_{x,y}\}$, operator $\Gamma \in \{\Delta_{x,y}, \Delta_x^\pm, \Sigma_{x,y}\}$ is defined by $\Gamma f = f \circ \gamma - f$.

Misanthrope's process ([15]). Let $p(.)$ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, with finite support, satisfying the irreducibility assumption $\sum_{n\geq 1}[p^{*n}(.) + p^{*n}(-.)] > 0$; $b(.,.)$ be a bounded function on $E \times E$ such that $b(0,.) = 0$, and either (if $\mathcal{K} = +\infty$) $b(n,m) > 0$ for $n > 0$, or (if $\mathcal{K} < +\infty$) $b(.,\mathcal{K}) = 0$ and $b(n,m) > 0$ for $n > 0$, $m < \mathcal{K}$. Then

$$L_0 = \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d} p(z)b(\eta(0),\eta(z))\Delta_{0,z} \tag{29}$$

Attractiveness holds if $b(n,m)$ is nondecreasing in n and nonincreasing in m. Algebraic conditions

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{b(n,m)}{b(m+1,n-1)} & = & \dfrac{b(n,0)b(1,m)}{b(m+1,0)b(1,n-1)} \\ \\ b(n,m)-b(m,n) & = & b(n,0)-b(m,0) \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

ensure product invariant measures ν_ρ with explicit marginals. (15) yields

$$h(\rho)=\left[\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d} zp(z)\right] H(\rho), \quad H(\rho):=\nu_\rho[b(\eta(x),\eta(y))],\ \forall x\neq y \tag{31}$$

The model $b(n,m)=f(n)(1-af(m))$ contains simple exclusion ($\mathcal{K}=1$) and zero-range processes ($\mathcal{K}=+\infty$, $a=0$) , where f is any nondecreasing function on E such that $f(0)=0<f(1)$, $a=1/f(\mathcal{K})$ if $\mathcal{K}<+\infty$, or $0\le a\le 1/f(+\infty)$ if $\mathcal{K}=+\infty$. See [4] for other examples. Let

$$\overline{b}^{+}(\rho,n)=\sum_m \theta_\rho(m)b(m,n), \quad \overline{b}^{-}(n,\rho)=\sum_m \theta_\rho(m)b(n,m) \tag{32}$$

Then for $p(1)=1$,

$$L_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.)}=\sum_{x=1}^{N-2} L_x+\overline{b}^{+}(\lambda_a,\eta^\circ(1))\Delta_1^{+}+\overline{b}^{-}(\eta^\circ(N-1),\lambda_b)\Delta_{N-1}^{-}$$

where the first term is the bulk generator (i.e. the part that does not involve interaction with reservoirs) and the next terms are the boundary part. For simple exclusion (32) yields the usual entrance/exit rates ([45, 46, 16]: $\overline{b}^{+}(\rho,n)=\rho(1-n)$, $\overline{b}^{-}(n,\rho)=n(1-\rho)$. For the zero-range process H in (31) is increasing, thus the BLN boundary condition (19)–(20) reduces to a Dirichlet condition at $x=0$, and is void at $x=1$. Microscopic counterparts are (since $b(n,m)$ depends only on n) the entrance rate independent of the particle configuration and the exit rate independent of the reservoir density.

Asymmetric exclusion with overtaking ([3]). Let $\mathcal{K}=1$, $(e_1,\dots,e_d)$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathcal{D}=\{\pm e_1,\dots,\pm e_d\}$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $\beta_j^\alpha\ge 0$ for $\alpha\in\mathcal{D}$ and $j=1,\dots,k$, $\beta_1^\alpha+\beta_1^{-\alpha}>0$ (irreducibility), $\beta_{j+1}^\alpha\le\beta_j^\alpha$ (attractiveness). Then

$$L_0=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}}\sum_{j=1}^{k} c_j^\alpha(\eta)\Delta_{0,j\alpha} \tag{33}$$

where

$$c_j^\alpha(\eta) := \beta_j^\alpha \prod_{n=0}^{j-1} \eta(n\alpha) \tag{34}$$

In words, a particle jumps to the first vacant site in a random direction $\alpha = \pm e_i$ with rate β_j^α if it is $j \le k$ sites ahead. ν_ρ is the product Bernoulli measure with mean $\rho \in [0,1]$. Thus (15) yields

$$h(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^d h_i(\rho) e_i \quad \text{with} \quad h_i(\rho) := \rho(1-\rho) \sum_{j=1}^k (\beta_j - \beta_{-j})\, \rho^{j-1} \tag{35}$$

By a proper choice of parameters, (35) can produce any polynomial vanishing at $\rho = 0$ and $\rho = 1$. Assume $d = 1$, $\mathcal{D} = \{\pm 1\}$, $k = 2$, $\beta_j^\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha = -1$, $\beta_j^1 = \beta_j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.)} &= \sum_{x=1}^{N-3} L_x + \beta_1 \Delta_{N-2,N-1} \\ + \quad & (\beta_1 \lambda_a + \beta_2 \lambda_a^2) \Delta_1^+ + \beta_2 \lambda_a \eta^\circ(1) \Delta_2^+ \\ + \quad & [\beta_1(1-\lambda_b) + \beta_2 \lambda_b (1-\lambda_b)] \Delta_{N-1}^- + \beta_2 (1-\lambda_b) \eta^\circ(N-1) \Delta_{N-2}^- \end{aligned}$$

where the first line is the bulk generator and the sequel is the boundary part.

Compound exclusion process. This model in the spirit of [42] illustrates multiple simultaneous jumps. Here $d = 1$ and $\mathcal{K} = 1$,

$$L_0 f = f \circ \sigma_{2,3} \circ \delta^{0,1} - f = (\Sigma_{2,3} \circ \Delta_{0,1} + \Sigma_{2,3} + \Delta_{0,1}) f \tag{36}$$

which means that simultaneously a jump $0 \to 1$ is attempted and an exchange $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ performed. By standard coupling methods of [44] one shows (71), where ν_ρ is the product Bernoulli measure with mean ρ. Hence (15) yields $h(\rho) = \rho(1-\rho)$. Let $\Omega_N = \{1, \dots, N-1\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.)} \quad = \quad & \sum_{x=1}^{N-4} L_x + \Sigma_{1,2} + \Delta_{N-2,N-1} \\ + \quad & \lambda_a \Delta_+^1 + (1-\lambda_a) \Delta_-^1 \\ + \quad & [1 - \lambda_a(1-\eta^\circ(1))] \Sigma^{2,3} + \lambda_a (1-\eta^\circ(1)) (\Delta_1^+ \circ \Sigma^{2,3} + \Delta_1^+ + \Sigma_{2,3}] \\ + \quad & (1-\lambda_b) \Delta_{N-1}^- + (1-\lambda_b) \eta^\circ(N-1) (\Delta_{N-3,N-2} \Delta_{N-1}^- + \Delta_{N-3,N-2} + \Delta_{N-1}^-) \\ + \quad & \lambda_b (1-\eta^\circ(N-1)) (\Delta_{N-3,N-2} \Delta_{N-1}^+ + \Delta_{N-3,N-2} + \Delta_{N-1}^+) \end{aligned}$$

where the first line is the bulk generator, lines 2–3 the left boundary part, and the sequel is the right boundary part.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Let us define the microscopic

$$\text{entropy} \quad : \quad \tilde{h}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi) := \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\le r} (\eta(x)-\xi(x))^{\pm} \tag{37}$$

$$\text{entropy production} \quad : \quad D^{\pm} := \tilde{L}_0\tilde{h}^{\pm} \tag{38}$$

$$\text{entropy flux} \quad : \quad \tilde{j}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi) := \tilde{L}_0\left[\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\le r} x(\eta(x)-\xi(x))^{\pm}\right] \tag{39}$$

where $\tilde{L}_0 = \tilde{L}_0^{(2)}$ is a monotone coupling of L_0 with itself defined in (65). In Lemma 3.1 we show that $\tilde{D}^{\pm} \le 0$. The notational convention in (37)–(39) and herafter is that $\pm$ is replaced by $+$ everywhere or $-$ everywhere. In Subsection 3.1 we define a coupling $\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N^1(.),\lambda_N^2(.)}$ of two open systems in Ω_N with microscopic reservoir profiles $\lambda_N^1(.)$ and $\lambda_N^2(.)$. We write $\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N^1(.),c}$ when $\lambda_N^2(.) \equiv c$. With this coupling we derive a microscopic counterpart to (17). For $0 \le \varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with compact support, let

$$F_\varphi^{\pm}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) := N^{-d}\sum_{x\in\Omega_N} \varphi(x/N)(\eta^\circ(x)-\xi^\circ(x))^{\pm} \tag{40}$$

We show in Subsection 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} N\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N^1(.),\lambda_N^2(.)}F_\varphi^{\pm}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) \;\le\; & N^{1-d}\sum_{x\in\Omega_N^{r\circ}} \varphi(x/N)\tau_x D^{\pm}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) \\ & + N^{-d}\sum_{x\in\Omega_N^{r\circ}} \partial_x\varphi(x/N).\tau_x\tilde{j}^{\pm}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) \\ & + C_1N^{1-d}\sum_{x\in\partial\Omega_N^{2r+}} \varphi(x/N)(\lambda_N^1(x)-\lambda_N^2(x))^{\pm} \\ & + C_2N^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

(see notations (7)–(9)), where C_1 depends only on $\tilde{L}_0$, and C_2 on $\tilde{L}_0$, Ω, φ and $\sup\{\lambda_N(x) : N \in \mathbb{N},\, x \in \Omega_N\}$. (41) is a generalization of the microscopic

entropy inequalities of [55], where the boundary term is the key novelty.

Step two: mesoscopic entropy inequalities. Let $(\eta_t^{N\circ}, \xi_t^{N\circ})$ be a coupled process with generator $\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c}$ and initial distribution $\tilde{\mu}^{N\circ,c} := \nu^\circ_{\Omega_N,\rho^N(.),c}$ defined in (66), that is a coupling of $\mu^{N\circ}$ and ν_c°; this particular choice of initial distribution will be used only in (53)). Let $0 \leq \varphi \in C^\infty([0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ with support contained in $[0,+\infty)\times K$ for some compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For $t \in [0,+\infty)$, let $\varphi_t = \varphi(t,.)$, and consider the mean zero martingale

$$M_t^{N\pm}(\varphi) := F^\pm_{\varphi_t}(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}, \xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}) - F^\pm_{\varphi_0}(\eta_0^{N\circ}, \xi_0^{N\circ}) - \int_0^t \left\{\partial_s + N\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c}\right\} F^\pm_{\varphi_s}(\eta^{N\circ}_{Ns}, \xi^{N\circ}_{Ns})ds \tag{42}$$

In Subsection 3.3 we prove that, for every $T > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(M_T^{N\pm}(\varphi)\right)^2\right] \leq C(T,\Omega,\varphi,\tilde{L}_0)N^{-d} \tag{43}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}^{N\pm}(\varphi) &:= \int_0^{+\infty} N^{-d} \sum_{x\in\Omega_N} \partial_t\varphi(t,x/N)(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}(x) - \xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}(x))^\pm dt && (44)\\
&+ \int_0^{+\infty} N^{-d} \sum_{x\in\Omega_N^{r\circ}} \partial_x\varphi(t,x/N).\tau_x\tilde{j}^\pm(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}(x), \xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}(x))dt && (45)\\
&+ \int_0^{+\infty} C_1 N^{1-d} \sum_{x\in\partial\Omega_N^{2r+}} \varphi(t,x/N)\phi_c^\pm(\lambda_N(x))dt && (46)\\
&+ F^\pm_{\varphi_0}(0,\eta_0^{N\circ},\xi_0^{N\circ}) && (47)
\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{K}_1^{N\pm}(\varphi) = (44) + (45)$, $\mathcal{K}_2^{N\pm}(\varphi) = (46)$, $\mathcal{K}_3^{N\pm}(\varphi) = (47)$. By (42), (43), (41) and $D^\pm \leq 0$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\mathcal{K}^{N\pm}(\varphi)^- = 0 \tag{48}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. For $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, let $\mathcal{K}_i^\pm(\varphi,\rho)$ denote the i-th integral in the l.h.s. $\mathcal{K}^\pm(\varphi,\rho)$ of (17), where $\phi = \phi_c^\pm$. We show below that

$$\lim_{l\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left|\mathcal{K}_i^{N\pm}(\varphi) - \mathcal{K}_i^\pm(\varphi,\rho^{N,l})\right| = 0 \tag{49}$$

where

$$\rho^{N,l}(t,x) = A^{[Nx],l}\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt} := (2l+1)^{-1} \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d:|y-x|\leq r} \eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}(y) \tag{50}$$

This implies a mesoscopic version of (17):

$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\mathcal{K}(\varphi,\rho^{N,l})^{-}=0 \tag{51}$$

For $i=2$, (49) follows from (11), since

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty}(46)\leq M\int_{(0,+\infty)\times\partial\Omega}\varphi(t,x)\phi_c^{\pm}(\hat{\lambda}(x))dt\,d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \tag{52}$$

where M depends only on $\tilde{L}_0$. For $i=3$, (49) follows from (68), since

$$\tilde{\mu}^{N\circ,c}-\lim_{N\to\infty}(47)=\int_{\Omega}\varphi(0,x)\phi_c^{\pm}(\rho_0(x))dx \tag{53}$$

where $\tilde{\mu}^{N\circ,c}-\lim$ denotes convergence in $\tilde{\mu}^{N\circ,c}$-probability. For (49) with $i=1$, we prove in subsection 3.4 that, for every $\varepsilon>0$ and compact $K\subset\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\left|(44)-\int_{(0,+\infty)\times K_{\varphi}^{l/N}}\partial_t\varphi(t,x)\phi_c^{\pm}(A^{[Nx],l}\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ})dtdx\right|=0 \tag{54}$$

$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\left|(45)-\int_{(0,+\infty)\times K_{\varphi}^{l/N}}\partial_x\varphi(t,x).\psi_c^{\pm}(A^{[Nx],l}\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ})dtdx\right|=0 \tag{55}$$

Step three: passing to the limit. We skip here some technical details similar to [55]. A Young measure $\pi(dt,dx,d\rho)$ ([11]) is a nonnegative measure on $(0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathcal{R}$ whose projection on $(0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ is the Lebesgue measure $dtdx$. It is called a measure-valued (mv) entropy solution to (16) with data $\rho_0\in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$, $\hat{\lambda}\in L^{\infty}(\partial\Omega)$, iff. it satisfies the extension of (17), where the l.h.s. $\mathcal{K}^{\pm}(\varphi,\rho)$ is replaced by (with $\phi=\phi_c^{\pm}$)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}^{\pm}(\varphi,\pi) &:= \int\left[\partial_t\varphi(t,x)\phi(\rho)+\partial_x\varphi(t,x).\psi(\rho)\right]\pi(td,tx,d\rho) \\ &+ M\int_{(0,+\infty)\times\partial\Omega}\varphi(t,x)\phi(\hat{\lambda}(x))dt\,d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x)+\int_{\Omega}\varphi(0,x)\phi(\rho_0(x))dx\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

$\rho(.,.)$ is an entropy solution iff. $\pi(dt,dx,d\rho)=dtdx\delta_{\rho(.,.)}$ is a mv entropy solution. For $N\in\mathbb{N}$ and $l\in\mathbb{N}$, define the random Young measure

$$\pi^{N,l}(dt,dx,d\rho):=dtdx\delta_{\rho^{N,l}(t,x)}(d\rho) \tag{57}$$

By corollary 3.1,$(\pi^{N,l})_{N,l}$ is tight for the topology defined by convergence on functions F such that $|F(t,x,\rho)| \leq C(1+\rho)1_K(t,x)$ for some $C>0$ and compact K. Since $\mathcal{K}^{\pm}(\varphi,\rho^{N,l}) = \mathcal{K}^{\pm}(\varphi,\pi^{N,l})$, any subsequential weak limit of $\pi^{N,l}$ as $N\to\infty$, $l\to\infty$ is supported on mv entropy solutions. By uniqueness of the latter ([64]), we have $\pi^{N,l}(dt,dx,d\rho)\longrightarrow dtdx\delta_{\rho(t,x)}(d\rho)$ in distribution, where $\rho(.,.)$ is the unique entropy solution. This implies, for every compact $K\subset(0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\int_K \left|A^{[Nx],l}\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}-\rho(t,x)\right|dtdx = 0 \tag{58}$$

To conclude, we need to prove $\alpha^N_{Nt}(dx) := \alpha^N(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt})(dx) \to \alpha_t(dx) := \rho(t,x)dx$ in probability for each $t>0$. This follows from (58) if we prove

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s\in[t,t+\varepsilon]}\left|\int\varphi d\alpha^N_{Nt}-\int\varphi d\alpha^N_{Ns}\right|>\delta\right)=0 \tag{59}$$

for every $\varphi\in C^\infty(\Omega)$ with compact support and every $\delta>0$. (59) is shown by considering martingale (42) $c=0$ and $\varphi_t=\varphi$, so that

$$F^+_\varphi(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt},\xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}) = \alpha^N_{Nt}(\varphi),\quad D^+(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt},\xi^{N\circ}_{Nt})=0,\quad \tilde{j}^+(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt},\xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}) = j(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt})$$

The result then follows from (41), (43) and Doob's inequality.

3.1 Coupling formalism

We consider models for which L_0 can be represented as follows:

$$L_0 f(\eta) = \int_{\mathcal{U}}[f(T^u\eta)-f(\eta)]dm(u) \tag{60}$$

where $(\mathcal{U},m)$ is a measurable space endowed with a finite nonnegative measure m and, for each $u\in\mathcal{U}$, $T^u:\mathbb{E}\to\mathbb{E}$ has the following properties: it is local, i.e. there exists $r\in\mathbb{N}$ (independent of u) such that $T^u\eta(x)=\eta(x)$ for all $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\backslash B_r(0)$, and $T^u\eta$ depends only on the restriction of η to $\mathbb{Z}\cap B_r(0)$; T^u is conservative, moves a bounded number of particles and is monotone:

$$\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\leq r} T^u\eta(x) \;=\; \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\leq r}\eta(x) \tag{61}$$

$$\mathcal{N} \;:=\; \sup_{\eta\in\mathbb{E},\,u\in\mathcal{U}}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\leq r}|T^u\eta(x)-\eta(x)| < +\infty \tag{62}$$

$$\eta\leq\xi \;\Rightarrow\; T^u\eta\leq T^u\xi \tag{63}$$

We set $T^{x,u} = \tau_x T^u \tau_{-x}$. Let us illustrate (60) for models of Subsection 2.2:

Misanthrope's process. $\mathcal{U} = (0, \sup b) \times \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mu(dvdz) = 1_{(0,\sup b)} dv \otimes p(dz)$. For $(v,z) \in \mathcal{U}$, $T^{(v,z)}\eta = \delta_{0,z}\eta$ if $v \le b(\eta(0), \eta(z))$; $T^{(v,z)}\eta = \eta$ otherwise. Monotonicity assumptions on $b(.,.)$ imply (63).

Asymmetric exclusion process with overtaking. $\mathcal{U} = (0,1) \times \mathcal{D}$, $\mu(dv, d\alpha) = dz \otimes \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \delta_x(d\alpha)$. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{E}$, let $z_\alpha(\eta)$ denote the first vacant site in direction α starting from (but excluding) the origin; set $z_\alpha(\eta) = 0$ if there is no such vacant site. For $(v, \alpha) \in \mathcal{U}$, set: $T^{(v,\alpha)}\eta = \delta_{0, z_\alpha(\eta)}\eta$ if $v \le \beta^\alpha_{z_\alpha(\eta)}$; $T^{(v,\alpha)}\eta = \eta$ otherwise. $\beta^\alpha_{j+1} \le \beta^\alpha_j$ implies (63).

Compound exclusion process. $\mathcal{U} = \{u\}$, $\mu = \delta_u$ and $T^u = \sigma^{2,3} \circ \delta_{2,1}$.

We couple n systems on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with common generator (2)–(60) by

$$\tilde{L}^{(n)} = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{L}^{(n)}_x, \quad \tilde{L}^{(n)}_x := \tau_x \tilde{L}^{(n)}_0 \tau_{-x} \tag{64}$$

$$\tilde{L}^{(n)}_0 f(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} [f(T^u\eta_1, \ldots, T^u\eta_n) - f(\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n)] dm(u) \tag{65}$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto F_\rho(x) := \nu_\rho(\eta(0) \le x)$, with generalized inverse F^{-1}_ρ (note that F^{-1}_ρ is nondecreasing wrt ρ by (73)). Let $(U(x), x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ be i.i.d. uniform random variables on $[0,1]$. Given $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, define the probability measures

$$\nu^{\circ(k)}_{S,\rho^1(.),\ldots,\rho^k(.)} \stackrel{distr.}{:=} (F^{-1}_{\rho^1(x)}(U(x)), \ldots, F^{-1}_{\rho^k(x)}(U(x)))_{x \in S} \tag{66}$$

$$\overline{\nu}^{(k)}_{S,\lambda^1(.),\ldots,\lambda^k(.)} \stackrel{distr.}{:=} (F^{-1}_{\lambda^1(x)}(U(x)), \ldots, F^{-1}_{\lambda^k(x)}(U(x)))_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus S} \tag{67}$$

where $\rho^1(.), \ldots, \rho^k(.)$, resp. $\lambda^1(.), \ldots, \lambda^k(.)$, are bounded $\mathcal{R}$-valued fields on S, resp. $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus S$. In (64), (66)–(67) and below, we drop (n) when $n = 2$ and write c for $\lambda^k(.) \equiv c$ or $\rho^k(.) \equiv c$. Note that

$$\nu^\circ_{S,\rho^1(.),\rho^2(.)} \left[(\overline{\eta}_1(x) - \overline{\eta}_2(x))^\pm \right] = (\rho^1(x) - \rho^2(x))^\pm \tag{68}$$

for $x \in S$, and similarly for the outer measure $\overline{\nu}$. We define "mixed" coupled processes where some components may evolve in S, and others (indexed by $\emptyset$) in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For instance,

$$\tilde{L}^{(3)}_{S,\lambda^1(.),\lambda^2(.),\emptyset} f(\eta^\circ_1, \eta^\circ_2, \eta_3) := \int \tilde{L} f(\eta^\circ_1 \oplus \overline{\eta}_1, \eta^\circ_2 \oplus \overline{\eta}_2, \eta_3) d\overline{\nu}^{(3)}_{S,\lambda^1(.),\lambda^2(.)}(\overline{\eta}_1, \overline{\eta}_2) \tag{69}$$

is a coupling of $L_{S,\lambda^1(.)}$, $L_{S,\lambda^2(.)}$ and L. A subset of components is then Markovian with the generator defined from the sub-list of indexes. The process defined by (69) can be constructed from a Poisson measure ω on $(0,+\infty)\times S\times\mathcal{U}\times(E^{\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus S})^2$ with intensity

$$\ell(dt,dx,du,d\bar\eta_1,d\bar\eta_2)=1_{[0,+\infty)}(t)dt\otimes 1_S(x)dx\otimes m(du)\otimes\overline{\nu}^{(2)}_{S,\lambda^1(.),\lambda^2(.)}(d\bar\eta_1,d\bar\eta_2)$$

where dx denotes the counting measure on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For every $(t,x,u,\overline{\eta}_1,\overline{\eta}_2)\in\omega$, the configuration $(\eta_1^\circ,\eta_2^\circ,\eta_3)$ at time $t-$ becomes at time t:

$$(\eta_1^\circ,\eta_2^\circ,\eta_3)\mapsto\left(\left(T^{x,u}\eta_1^\circ\oplus\overline{\eta}_1\right)^\circ,\left(T^{x,u}\eta_2^\circ\oplus\overline{\eta}_2\right)^\circ,T^{x,u}\eta_3\right)\tag{70}$$

By the above construction, we have:

Proposition 3.1 *The subset of ordered configurations $\eta_1\le\cdots\le\eta_n$ (or $\eta_1^\circ\le\cdots\le\eta_n^\circ$) is stable for the coupling defined by (64)–(65), or by (69) with $\lambda^1(.)\le\cdots\le\lambda^n(.)$ containing no $\emptyset$.*

Corollary 3.1 *Let $\mu^\circ\le\nu_R^\circ$ ($R>0$) be a probability measure on E^S. Then*

$$\forall t>0,\quad \mu^\circ e^{tL_{S,\lambda(.)}}\le\nu^\circ_{\max\left[R;\sup_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus S}\lambda(x)\right]}$$

Attractiveness and irreducibility assumptions (see [47, 1, 15, 32] imply the following properties. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the set of invariant measures for $\widetilde{L}$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$ the set of translation invariant probability measures on $\mathbb{E}^2$. Then there exist probability measures $\tilde\nu_{\rho,\rho'}$ on $\mathbb{E}^2$ for $\rho,\rho'\in\mathcal{R}$, with marginals ν_ρ and $\nu_{\rho'}$, such that (e denoting extremal elements)

$$\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}\cap\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}\right)_e = \left\{\tilde\nu_{\rho,\rho'},\,(\rho,\rho')\in\mathcal{R}^2\right\}\tag{71}$$

$$\rho\overset{\le}{\ge}\rho' \;\Rightarrow\; \tilde\nu_{\rho,\rho'}\{(\eta,\xi):\,\eta\overset{\le}{\ge}\xi\}=1\tag{72}$$

$$\rho\le\rho' \;\Rightarrow\; \nu_\rho\le\nu_{\rho'}\tag{73}$$

3.2 Proof of (41)

We first state properties of $\tilde h^\pm$, $\tilde D^\pm$, j and $\tilde j^\pm$ in (15), (37), (38) and (39).

Lemma 3.1 *For every $u\in\mathcal{U}$ and $(\eta,\xi)\in\mathbb{E}^2$,*

$$\tilde h^-(\eta,\xi)=\tilde h^+(\xi,\eta),\quad \tilde h^\pm(T^u\eta,T^u\xi)\le\tilde h^\pm(\eta,\xi)\tag{74}$$

$$D^{\pm} \le 0, \quad D^{\pm} = 0 \text{ on } \{\eta \le \xi\} \cup \{\eta \ge \xi\} \tag{75}$$

$$\tilde{j}^{-}(\eta,\xi) = \tilde{j}^{+}(\xi,\eta), \quad \tilde{j}^{+}(\eta,\xi) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \eta \le \xi \\ j(\eta) - j(\xi) & \text{if } \eta \ge \xi \end{cases} \tag{76}$$

$$\left|\tilde{j}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi)\right| \le C \min[1, \tilde{h}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi)] \tag{77}$$

$$\left|\tilde{j}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi) - \tilde{j}^{\pm}(\eta',\xi')\right| \le C[\tilde{h}(\eta,\eta') + \tilde{h}(\xi,\xi')] \tag{78}$$

for a constant $C = C(\tilde{L}_0)$*, where* $\tilde{h} := \tilde{h}^{+} + \tilde{h}^{-}$.

Proof of lemma 3.1. (75)–(78) follow with elementary algebra from definitions, (60)–(63) and (74). We prove the second statement in (74) for $\tilde{h}^{+}$, which implies the same for $\tilde{h}^{-}$ by the obvious first statement. Let $\chi_{-} := \eta \wedge \xi$ and $\chi_{+} := \eta \vee \xi$. Since T^u is nondecreasing,

$$T^u\chi_{-} \le T^u\eta \le T^u\chi_{+}, \quad T^u\chi_{-} \le T^u\xi \le T^u\chi_{+}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\le r} (T^u\eta(x) - T^u\xi(x))^{+} &\le \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\le r} (T^u\eta(x) - T^u\chi_{-}(x)) \\ &= \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\le r} (\eta(x) - \chi_{-}(x)) = \sum_{x\in S} (\eta(x) - \xi(x))^{+} \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (61). □

Proof of (41). By (64)–(65),

$$N\tilde{L}_x F^{\pm}_{\varphi}(\eta,\xi) = N\tilde{L}_x F^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta,\xi) \tag{79}$$

where

$$F^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) := N^{-d} \sum_{y\in B_r(x)\cap\Omega_N} \varphi(y/N)(\eta^{\circ}(y) - \xi^{\circ}(y))^{\pm} \tag{80}$$

For $x \in \Omega^{r\circ}_N$,

$$F^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) = N^{-d}\varphi(x/N)\tau_x\tilde{h}^{\pm}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) + G^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) \tag{81}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) &= N^{-d} \sum_{y\in B_r(x)} (\varphi(y/N) - \varphi(x/N))(\eta^{\circ}(y) - \xi^{\circ}(y))^{\pm} \qquad (82) \\ &= N^{-d-1}\partial_x\varphi(x/N).\tau_x\tilde{k}^{\pm}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) + R^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\tilde{k}^{\pm}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ)=\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\,|x|\le r} x(\eta^\circ(x)-\xi^\circ(x))^{\pm}$$

$$R^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ)=N^{-d}\sum_{y\in B_r(x)}[\varphi(y/N)-\varphi(x/N)-\partial_x\varphi(x/N).(y-x)/N](\eta^\circ(y)-\xi^\circ(y))^{\pm}$$

Hence (the expression below depends only on (η°,ξ°) because $x\in\Omega_N^{r\circ}$)

$$\begin{aligned} N\tilde{L}_xF^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) &= N^{1-d}\varphi(x/N)\tau_xD^{\pm}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) && (83)\\ &+ N^{-d}\partial_x\varphi(x/N).\tau_x\tilde{j}^{\pm}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) && (84)\\ &+ N\tilde{L}_xR^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta^\circ,\xi^\circ) && (85)\end{aligned}$$

(83)–(84) produce the first two lines on the r.h.s. of (41). By (65) and (62), (85) contributes to the last line of (41). For $x\in\partial\Omega_N^r$, by (79)–(82),

$$N\tilde{L}_xF^{\pm}_{\varphi,x}(\eta,\xi)=N^{1-d}\varphi(x/N)\tau_xD^{\pm}(\eta,\xi) \quad (86)$$

$$-\quad N^{1-d}\varphi(x/N)\tilde{L}_x\left[\sum_{y\in B_r(x)\setminus\Omega_N}(\eta(y)-\xi(y))^{\pm}\right] \quad (87)$$

$$+\quad N^{1-d}\tilde{L}_x\left\{\sum_{y\in B_r(x)}[\varphi(y/N)-\varphi(x/N)](\eta(y)-\xi(y))^{\pm}\right\} \quad (88)$$

By Lemma 3.1, (86) ≥ 0. By (65) and (62),

$$-\tilde{L}_x\left[\sum_{y\in B_r(x)\setminus\Omega_N}(\eta(y)-\xi(y))^{\pm}\right]\le 2\mathcal{N}m(\mathcal{U})\sum_{y\in B_r(x)\setminus\Omega_N}(\eta(y)-\xi(y))^{\pm}$$

By integration w.r.t. $\tilde{\nu}_{\Omega_N,\lambda^1_N(.),\lambda^2_N(.)}$ and (68), the contribution of (87) is bounded by line 3 of (41), plus an error that contributes to the last line of (41). By (65), (88) again contributes to the last line of (41).

3.3 Proof of (43)

We first derive a bound on entropy production.

Lemma 3.2 *For every* $0 < T < +\infty$,

$$\sup_{N\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^T N^{1-d} \sum_{x\in\Omega_N^{r\circ}} \varphi(t,x/N)\tau_x(-D^{\pm})(\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ},\xi_{Nt}^{N\circ})dt \right\} < +\infty \qquad (89)$$

Proof of lemma 3.2. Since $M_t^{N\pm}(\varphi)$ has mean zero,

$$\mathbb{E}F_{\varphi_t}^{\pm}(\eta_{NT}^{N\circ},\xi_{NT}^{N\circ}) - \mathbb{E}F_{\varphi_0}^{\pm}(\eta_0^{N\circ},\xi_0^{N\circ}) = \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \partial_t F_{\varphi_t}^{\pm}(\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ},\xi_{Nt}^{N\circ})dt \quad (90)$$

$$+\mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^T \left[N\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c} F_{\varphi_t}^{\pm}(\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ},\xi_{Nt}^{N\circ}) \right] dt \right\} \qquad (91)$$

We bound (90) by Corollary 3.1 and apply (41) and Lemma 3.1 to (91). □

The martingale defined by (42) has quadratic variation

$$\langle M_T^{N\pm}(\varphi)\rangle = \int_0^T N\left\{ \tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c}(F_{\varphi_t}^{\pm})^2 - 2F_{\varphi_t}^{\pm}\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c}(F_{\varphi_t}^{\pm}) \right\}(\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ},\xi_{Nt}^{N\circ})dt \qquad (92)$$

Then, (43) follows from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 below.

Lemma 3.3 *For every nonnegative* $\varphi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *with compact support,*

$$N\left\{ \tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c}\left(F_{\varphi}^{\pm}\right)^2 - 2F_{\varphi}^{\pm}\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c}F_{\varphi}^{\pm} \right\}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ})$$

$$\leq \quad C(\Omega,\varphi,\tilde{L}_0)\left[-N^{1-2d}\sum_{x\in\Omega_N^{r\circ}} \varphi(x/N)^2\tau_x D^{\pm}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ}) + N^{-d} \right] \qquad (93)$$

Proof of lemma 3.3. By (64)–(65),

$$\tilde{L}\left(F_{\varphi}^{\pm}\right)^2 - 2F_{\varphi}^{\pm}\tilde{L}F_{\varphi}^{\pm} = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{\mathcal{U}} \left[F_{\varphi,x}^{\pm}(T^{x,u}\eta,T^{x,u}\xi) - F_{\varphi,x}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi)\right]^2 dm(u) \quad (94)$$

(in fact $x \in \Omega_N^{r\circ} \cup \partial\Omega_N^r$) with $F_{\varphi,x}^{\pm}$ defined in (80). For $x \in \partial\Omega_N^r$, by (62),

$$\left[F_{\varphi,x}^{\pm}(T^{x,u}\eta,T^{x,u}\xi) - F_{\varphi,x}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi)\right]^2 \leq 4\mathcal{N}^2\,||\varphi||_{\infty}^2\,N^{-2d}1_K(x/N) \qquad (95)$$

for some compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. These terms in (94) contribute to N^{-d} in (93). For $x \in \Omega_N^{r\circ}$, by (81), (62) and (74), the l.h.s. of (95) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & -4\mathcal{N}N^{-2d}\varphi(x/N)^2\left[\tau_x\tilde{h}^{\pm}(T^{x,u}\eta^{\circ},T^{x,u}\xi^{\circ})-\tau_x\tilde{h}^{\pm}(\eta^{\circ},\xi^{\circ})\right] \\ + \quad & 4\mathcal{N}^2N^{-2d-2}\left|\left|\partial_x\varphi\right|\right|^2 1_K(x/N) \end{aligned}$$

whose first term produces the first term in (93), and second term again contributes to N^{-d} in (93). □

3.4 Proof of (54)–(55)

For every measurable subset K of $[0,+\infty)\times\Omega$, we define

$$\mathcal{I}_K^{\pm,N,l}(\eta_{\cdot}^{N\circ},\xi_{\cdot}^{N\circ})=\int_K\left|(2l+1)^{-d}\sum_{y\in B_l([Nx])}(\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ}(y)-\xi_{Nt}^{N\circ}(y))^{\pm}-\phi_c^{\pm}(A^{[Nx],l}\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ})\right|dtdx$$

$$\mathcal{J}_K^{\pm,N,l}(\eta_{\cdot}^{N\circ},\xi_{\cdot}^{N\circ})=\int_K\left|(2l+1)^{-d}\sum_{y\in B_l([Nx])}\tau_y\tilde{j}^{\pm}(\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ}(y),\xi_{Nt}^{N\circ}(y))-\psi_c^{\pm}(A^{[Nx],l}\eta_{Nt}^{N\circ})\right|dtdx$$

We prove that, for every compact K and $\varepsilon>0$, with $\mathcal{H}$ being $\mathcal{I}$ or $\mathcal{J}$,

$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\mathcal{H}_K^{\pm,N,l}(\eta_{\cdot}^{N\circ},\xi_{\cdot}^{N\circ})=0 \tag{96}$$

By finite coverings we are reduced to $K=(t_0-\delta,t_0+\delta)\times B_\delta(x_0)$ with $B_\delta(x_0)\subset\Omega$. We consider the coupled process $(\eta_{N(t_0-\delta)+t}^{N\circ},\xi_{N(t_0-\delta)+t}^{N\circ},\eta_t^{N'},\xi_t^{N'})$ with generator $\tilde{L}^{(4)}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),c,\emptyset,\emptyset}$, see (69), and $\eta_0^{'N}=\eta_{N(t_0-\delta)}^{N\circ}\oplus 0_{\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\Omega_N}$, $\xi_0^{'N\circ}=\xi_{N(t_0-\delta)}^{N\circ}\sim\nu_c^{\circ}$, $\xi_0^{'N}$ extended to $\mathbb{Z}^d$ so that $\xi_0^{'N}\sim\nu_c$. We claim that

$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\mathcal{H}^{\pm,N,l}_{(0,2\delta)\times B_\delta(x_0)}(\eta_{\cdot}^{'N},\xi_{\cdot}^{'N})=0 \tag{97}$$

(96) follows from (97), (78) and Lemma 3.4 below for $(\eta^{N\circ},\eta^{N'})$ and $(\xi^{N\circ},\xi^{N'})$. We sketch the proof of the claim, similar to [55]. Write

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{H}^{\pm,l}_{(0,2\delta)\times B_\delta(x_0)}(\eta_{\cdot}^{'N},\xi_{\cdot}^{'N})=|K|\,\mathbb{E}_{M_N}\left\{(2l+1)^{-d}\sum_{y\in B_l(0)}\tilde{g}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi)-G_c^{\pm}\left(A^{0,l}\eta\right)\right\} \tag{98}$$

$$M_N = |K|^{-1} \int_K \tau_{[Nx]} \tilde{\mu}'^N e^{Nt\tilde{L}} dt dx \tag{99}$$

where $\tilde{\mu}'^N \overset{distr.}{\sim} (\eta_0'^N, \xi_0'^N)$, $\tilde{g}^{\pm}(\eta,\xi) = (\eta(0) - \xi(0))^+$ and $G_c^{\pm} = \phi_c^{\pm}$ in $\mathcal{I}^{\pm,N,l}$, $\tilde{g}^{\pm} = \tilde{j}^{\pm}$ and $G_c^{\pm} = \psi_c^{\pm}$ in $\mathcal{J}^{\pm,N,l}$. M_N has ξ-marginal ν_c. By Corollary 3.1, $(M_N)_N$ is tight for the topology defined by convergence on functions F such that $|F(\eta,\xi)| \leq C(1 + \sum_{x\in T}[\eta(x) + \xi(x)])$ for some $C > 0$ and finite $T \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$. By (99), every subsequential weak limit M lies in $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}} \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$, hence by (71) is a mixture of measures $\tilde{\nu}_{\rho,\rho'}$ with imposed $\rho' = c$. $\limsup_{N\to\infty}(98)$ is the M-expectation of the quantity in braces. It is easy to see that the $\tilde{\nu}_{\rho,c}$-expectation of this quantity vanishes as $l \to \infty$ by (72), (76), (15), (18) and the spatial ergodic theorem.

Lemma 3.4 *Let $B_\delta(x_0) \subset \Omega$, and $(\chi_t^{N\circ}, \zeta_t^N)$ a coupled process with generator $\tilde{L}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),\emptyset}$ and $\chi_0^{N\circ} \leq \nu_R^\circ$, $\zeta_0^N \leq \nu_R$ in distribution for some $R \in \mathcal{R}$. Then, for every $t > 0$ and $0 < \delta' < \delta - Vt$, with $V = V(L_0)$ and $C = C(\delta, \delta', \tilde{L}_0)$:*

$$\mathbb{E}N^{-d} \sum_{x\in NB_{\delta'}(x_0)} \left|\chi_{Nt}^{N\circ}(x) - \zeta_{Nt}^N(x)\right| \leq \mathbb{E}N^{-d} \sum_{x\in NB_\delta(x_0)} \left|\chi_0^{N\circ}(x) - \zeta_0^N(x)\right| + CN^{-1}$$

Proof of lemma 3.4. Let $V > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and (with the notation of (40))

$$|x|_\varepsilon := \sqrt{|x|^2 + \varepsilon}, \quad \varphi(t,x) := H * \delta_\varepsilon(\delta - Vt - |x - x_0|_\varepsilon)$$

$$F(t,\chi^\circ,\zeta) := F^+_{\varphi(t,.)}(\chi^\circ,\zeta) + F^-_{\varphi(t,.)}(\chi^\circ,\zeta)$$

where H is the Heaviside function and δ_ε a standard mollifier. Using (42) for F, (41) and (77), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}F(t,\xi_{Nt}^{N\circ},\zeta_{Nt}^N) &\leq \mathbb{E}F(t,\xi_0^{N\circ},\zeta_0^N) + CN^{-1} \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\int_0^t N^{-d} \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \left\{\partial_s\varphi(s,x) + C\left|\partial_x\varphi(s,x)\right| \left|\xi_{Ns}^{N\circ} - \zeta_{Ns}^N(x)\right|\right\} ds\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$, where expectations exist by Corollary 3.1. Since

$$\partial_t\varphi(t,x) + V\left|\partial_x\varphi(t,x)\right| \leq 0$$

we obtain for large V (which implies the result for small ε)

$$\mathbb{E}F(t,\chi_{Nt}^{N\circ},\zeta_{Nt}^N) \leq \mathbb{E}F(t,\chi_0^{N\circ},\zeta_0^N) + CN^{-1}t$$

□

4 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Proof of (i). (28) implies tightness of $\left(\alpha^N(\eta^\circ)\right)_N$. Given $\rho \in \mathcal{R}$, we set $\nu^\circ_{\rho,t} := \nu^\circ_\rho e^{tL_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.)}}$. By (28), Proposition 3.1 and stationarity of $\nu^{N\circ}$,

$$\nu^{N\circ}_{0,Nt} \le \nu^{N\circ} \le \nu^{N\circ}_{R,Nt} \tag{100}$$

Let $M^{N\circ} := \nu^{N\circ} \circ \alpha_N^{-1}$, $M^{N\circ}_{\rho,t} := \nu^{N\circ}_{\rho,t} \circ \alpha_N^{-1}$. We consider on the set of Radon measures on Ω the partial order defined by $\alpha \le \beta$ iff. $\beta - \alpha$ is a nonnegative measure. Since $\eta^\circ \mapsto \alpha^N(\eta^\circ)$ is nondecreasing,

$$M^{N\circ}_{0,Nt} \le M^{N\circ} \le M^{N\circ}_{R,Nt} \tag{101}$$

for the associated stochastic order. By Theorem 2.1, any subsequential weak limit M° of $M^{N\circ}$ as $N \to \infty$ satisfies

$$\delta_{\rho^0(t,.)dx} \le M^\circ \le \delta_{\rho^R(t,.)dx} \tag{102}$$

for every $t > 0$, where $\rho^r(.,.)$ denotes the entropy solution to (16) with data $\rho^r_0(.) \equiv r$ in Ω and $\hat\lambda(.)$ on $\partial\Omega$. By Theorem 2.2, $\rho^0(t,.)$ and $\rho^R(t,.)$ converge to $R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ as $t \to \infty$ in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega^n_{a,b})$. $t \to \infty$ in (102) shows that the restriction of M° to $\Omega^n_{a,b}$ is $\delta_{R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a,\lambda_b)dx}$.

Proof of (ii). Set $c := R_{h(.).n}(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$. Let $(\eta^{N\circ}_t, \eta^{N\circ}_{0,t}, \eta^{N\circ}_{R,t}, \xi^{N\circ}_t)$ be coupled with generator $\tilde L^{(4)}_{\Omega_N,\lambda_N(.),\lambda_N(.),\lambda_N(.),c}$, $\eta^\circ_{r,0} \sim \nu^\circ_r$ for $r \in \{0, R\}$, $\xi^{N\circ}_0 \sim \nu^\circ_c$, and

$$0_{\Omega_N} \equiv \eta^{N\circ}_{0,0} \le \eta^{N\circ}_0 \le \eta^{N\circ}_{R,0} \tag{103}$$

a.s., which is possible by (73) and (28). We apply (96) to $(\eta^{N\circ}_{r,.}, \xi^{N\circ}_.)$ and (58) to $\eta^{N\circ}_{r,.}$ (here with limiting Young measure $dtdx\delta_{\rho^r(t,x)}(d\rho)$). This yields

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T \int_K \left(\eta^{N\circ}_{r,Nt}([Nx]) - \xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}([Nx])\right)^\pm dxdt\right\} = \int_0^T \int_K (\rho^r(t,x) - c)^+ dxdt$$

for any $T > 0$ and compact $K \subset \Omega^n_{a,b}$. By Theorem 2.2 applied to ρ^r,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left\{T^{-1} \int_0^T \int_K \left(\eta^{N\circ}_{r,Nt}([Nx]) - \xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}([Nx])\right)^\pm dxdt = 0\right\} \tag{104}$$

for $r \in \{0, R\}$. By (103) and Proposition 3.1, $\eta^{N\circ}_{0,Nt} \le \eta^{N\circ}_{Nt} \le \eta^{N\circ}_{R,Nt}$. Thus,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left\{T^{-1}\int_0^T\int_K \left|\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}([Nx]) - \xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}([Nx])\right| dxdt = 0\right\} \qquad (105)$$

Since g is bounded and local, $|g(\eta) - g(\xi)| \le C\sum_{x\in B_l(0)} |\eta(x) - \xi(x)|$ for some $C > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Stationarity of $\nu^{N\circ}$ and $\xi^{N\circ}_t \sim \nu^{N\circ}_c$ imply, for some compact $K' \subset \Omega^n_{a,b}$ (which concludes the proof by (105)),

$$\begin{aligned}\int_K |\bar g_N(x) - \bar g|\, dx &= T^{-1}\int_K \left|\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \left[\tau_{[Nx]}g\left(\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}\right) - \tau_{[Nx]}g\left(\xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}\right)\right] dt\right| \\ &\le C\mathbb{E}\left\{T^{-1}\int_0^T\int_{K'} \left|\eta^{N\circ}_{Nt}([Nx]) - \xi^{N\circ}_{Nt}([Nx])\right| dxdt\right\}\end{aligned}$$

5 Proof of Theorem 2.2

We need comparison results for entropy sub/super solutions. An entropy sub-solution, resp. super-solution ([10]) to (16), is defined by restricting (17) to $(\phi, \psi) = (\phi^+_c, \psi^+_c)$, resp. $(\phi, \psi) = (\phi^-_c, \psi^-_c)$, and lies in $C^0([0, +\infty); L^1_{\rm loc}(\Omega))$ by [52].

Proposition 5.1 *Let $\rho^1(.,.)$ (resp. $\rho^2(.,.)$) be an entropy sub-solution (resp. super-solution) to (16) in Ω for data $\rho^1_0(.)$, $\rho^2_0(.)$ in Ω and $\hat\lambda_1(.) \le \hat\lambda_2(.)$ in $\partial\Omega$. Then, setting $V = \max\left(||h' \circ \rho^1_0||_\infty, ||h' \circ \rho^2_0||_\infty\right)$,*

$$\int_{\Omega\cap B(x_0,R)} (\rho^1(t,x) - \rho^2(t,x))^+ dx \le \int_{\Omega\cap B(x_0,R+Vt)} (\rho^1_0(x) - \rho^2_0(x))^+ dx \quad (106)$$

for every $t > 0$, $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $R > 0$. In particular (maximum principle),

$$\rho^1(.,.) \le \max_\Omega(\rho^1_0(.)) \vee \max_{\partial\Omega} \hat\lambda_1(.),\ \rho^2(.,.) \ge \min_\Omega(\rho^2_0(.)) \wedge \min_{\partial\Omega} \hat\lambda_2(.) \qquad (107)$$

(106) follows from Lemma 2 of [64] by standard arguments, and (107) by taking constants as particular entropy solutions. The next one is proved in Appendix A.1.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $\rho(.,.)$ be the entropy solution to (16) in $\Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with data $\rho_0(.)$ in Ω_1, $\hat\lambda(.)$ on $\partial\Omega_1$. Let Ω_2 be an open subset of Ω_1, $\Sigma \subset \partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega_2$, and $R^\pm$ constants such that $R^- \le \rho \le R^+$ a.e. in $(0, +\infty)\times\Omega_2$. Let $\hat\lambda^\pm(.)$ be equal to $\hat\lambda(.)$ on Σ and $R^\pm$ on $\partial\Omega_2\backslash\Sigma$. Then $\rho(.,.)$ is an entropy sub-solution (resp. super-solution) to (16) in Ω_2 for data $\rho_0(.)$ restricted to Ω_2 and $\hat\lambda^+(.)$ (resp. $\hat\lambda^-(.)$) on $\partial\Omega_2$.*

5.1 The case $\Omega = \Omega^n_{a,b}$

By Proposition 5.1, the entropy solution $\rho(.,.)$ lies between entropy solutions with the same boundary datum and uniform initial data 0 and $||\rho_0||_\infty$. Thus it is enough to consider uniform data $\rho_0(.) \equiv r \in \mathcal{R}$ on $\Omega^n_{a,b}$. Let $\rho_n(t,y)$ be the entropy solution to

$$\partial_t \rho(t,y) + \partial_y h_n(\rho(t,y)) = 0 \tag{108}$$

on (a,b), with $h_n(.) := h(.).n$, data $\rho_0(.) \equiv r$ in (a,b), and $\hat{\lambda}(\gamma) = \lambda_\gamma$ on $\{a,b\}$. It is easy to see that

Lemma 5.2 *$\rho(t,x) := \rho_n(t,n.x)$, defined for $(t,x) \in (0,+\infty) \times \Omega^n_{a,b}$, is the entropy solution to (16) with data $\rho_0(.) \equiv r$ in $\Omega^n_{a,b}$ and (23) on $\partial\Omega^n_{a,b}$.*

We are now reduced to proving

Proposition 5.2 *Let $f \in C^1(\mathcal{R})$, and $\rho(t,x)$ be the entropy solution to*

$$\partial_t \rho + \partial_x f(\rho) = 0 \tag{109}$$

on (a,b), with data $\rho_0(.) \equiv r \in \mathcal{R}$ in (a,b) and $\hat{\lambda}(\gamma) := \lambda_\gamma$ on $\{a,b\}$. If $\mathcal{M}_f(\lambda_a,\lambda_b) = \{R_f(\lambda_a,\lambda_b)\}$, then $\rho(t,.) \to R_f(\lambda_a,\lambda_b)$ in $L^1((a,b))$ as $t \to \infty$.

The following particular case will be proved in Subsection 5.2.

Lemma 5.3 *In the context of Proposition 5.2, assume $\lambda_a = \lambda_b = \lambda$ with $f'(\lambda) \neq 0$. Then, for any $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $\rho(t,.) \to \lambda$ in $L^1((a,b))$ as $t \to \infty$.*

Proof of proposition 5.2. We treat $\lambda_a \leq \lambda_b$, the other case is similar. For $\gamma \in \{a,b\}, t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\rho^\gamma(t,x)$ be the minimizer of $f(\rho) - \rho[x - (a+b-\gamma)]/t$ on I_γ, with $I_a = [\lambda^f_a, \lambda_b]$ and $I_b = [\lambda_a, \lambda^f_b]$. We claim that the restriction of ρ^γ to $(0,+\infty)\times(a,b)$ is the entropy solution to (109) with uniform initial datum λ^f_γ in (a,b), and boundary datum $\hat{\lambda}(.)$ on $\{a,b\}$. Indeed: one the one hand, by [5, Proposition 4.2], ρ^γ is defined (i.e. the minimizer unique) a.e. and is the entropy solution to (109) on $\mathbb{R}$ with initial datum $\min(I_\gamma)1_{(-\infty,a+b-\gamma)} + \max(I_\gamma)1_{(a+b-\gamma,+\infty)}$, whose restriction to (a,b) is λ^f_γ; on the other hand, the definition of $\rho^\gamma(.,.)$ easily implies BLN boundary conditions $\rho^\gamma(t,a^+) \in \mathcal{E}^{f(.)}_{\lambda_a}$ and $\rho^\gamma(t,b^-) \in \mathcal{E}^{-f(.)}_{\lambda_b}$, with the sets defined in (20). This proves the claim.

Since $R_f(\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ is the unique minimizer of f on either interval I_γ for $\gamma \in \{a, b\}$, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho^\gamma(t, x) = R_f(\lambda_a, \lambda_b), \quad \forall x \in (a, b) \tag{110}$$

By definition of λ_a^f and λ_b^f, there are sequences (λ_a^k), (λ_b^k) such that

$$\lambda_a^k \uparrow \lambda_a^f,\ \lambda_b^k \downarrow \lambda_b^f, \quad f'(\lambda_a^k) \neq 0, \quad f'(\lambda_b^k) \neq 0 \tag{111}$$

as $k \to \infty$. By Proposition 5.1 and semigroup property, for $0 < s < t$,

$$\int_{(a,b)} (\rho(t, x) - \rho^\gamma(s, x))^{\sigma_\gamma} dx \leq \int_{(a,b)} (\rho(t - s, x) - \lambda_\gamma^f)^{\sigma_\gamma} dx \tag{112}$$

with signs $\sigma_a = -$, $\sigma_b = +$. For $\gamma \in \{a, b\}$, let $\rho_k^\gamma(t, x)$ be the entropy solution to (109) with uniform data r in (a, b) and λ_γ^k on $\{a, b\}$. By Proposition 5.1,

$$\rho_k^a(t - s, .) \leq \rho(t - s, .) \leq \rho_k^b(t - s, .) \tag{113}$$

By Lemma 5.3 applied to ρ_k^γ,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho_k^\gamma(t - s, x) = \lambda_\gamma^k \quad \text{in } L^1((a, b)) \tag{114}$$

We take $\limsup_{s\to\infty} \limsup_{t\to\infty}$ in (112). By (110) for the l.h.s, (113)–(114) for the r.h.s.,

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \int_{(a,b)} (\rho(t, x) - R_f(\lambda_a, \lambda_b))^{\sigma_\gamma} dx \leq (b - a)(\lambda_\gamma^k - \lambda_\gamma^f)^{\sigma_\gamma}$$

and we conclude with $k \to \infty$ and (111). □

5.2 Proof of Lemma 5.3

The result is trivial for $r = \lambda$: then $\rho(t, .) \equiv \lambda$. We treat $r > \lambda$, $r < \lambda$ being similar. Let $\tilde{\rho}(t, x)$ be the entropy solution to (109) on $\mathbb{R}$ with datum

$$\tilde{\rho}_0(x) = \lambda \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty,a)\cup(b,+\infty)}(x) + r \mathbf{1}_{(a,b)}(x) \tag{115}$$

$\tilde{\rho}_0(.)$ has bounded space variation, thus also $\tilde{\rho}(t, .)$ for $t > 0$ (see e.g. [57] or [63]). Hence, limits $\tilde{\rho}(t, x^\pm)$ exist. By maximum principle (107),

$$\rho(t, .) \geq \lambda, \quad \tilde{\rho}(t, .) \geq \lambda \tag{116}$$

for every $t > 0$. By (116) and Lemma 5.1 applied to $\tilde{\rho}$, with $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$, $\Omega_2 = (a, b)$, $\Sigma = \emptyset$ and $R^- = \lambda$, the restriction of $\tilde{\rho}$ to (a, b) is an entropy super-solution to (109) in (a, b) for the same initial and boundary data as ρ. Thus, by Proposition 5.1, $\rho(, .) \leq \tilde{\rho}(t, .)$ for every $t > 0$. To conclude we show that, for any bounded interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\tilde{\rho} \leq \lambda + \varepsilon \text{ in } I \text{ for large enough } t \tag{117}$$

We prove (117) as follows. The initial condition (115) crosses $\lambda+\varepsilon$ at a and b. In Proposition A.1, we prove that there are uniformly Lipschitz trajectories $x_1(.) \leq x_2(.)$ such that $x_1(0) = a$, $x_2(0) = b$, and for all $t > 0$: $\rho(t, .) \leq \lambda + \varepsilon$ on $(-\infty, x_1(t)) \cup (x_2(t), +\infty)$, $\rho(t, .) \geq \lambda + \varepsilon$ on $(x_1(t), x_2(t))$, and $x_1(t) = x_2(t)$ implies $x_1(s) = x_2(s)$ for all $s > t$. The latter implies (117). We claim that $x_1(t) < x_2(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ implies $\lim_{t\to\infty} x_1(t) = +\infty$ if $f'(\lambda) > 0$, or $\lim_{t\to\infty} x_2(t) = -\infty$ if $f'(\lambda) < 0$, whereby (117) follows. We prove the first part of the claim, the second one being similar. Set

$$v = v(\lambda, \lambda + \varepsilon) := \inf_{\theta\in[\lambda,\lambda+\varepsilon)} \frac{f(\lambda + \varepsilon) - f(\theta)}{\lambda + \varepsilon - \theta} \tag{118}$$

$v(\lambda, \lambda + \varepsilon) > 0$ for small ε. Let $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\delta\varepsilon > \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\tilde{\rho}_0(x) - (\lambda + \varepsilon))^+ = (b - a)(r - (\lambda + \varepsilon)) \tag{119}$$

Set $x(t) := a - \delta + vt$, and

$$T := \sup\{\tau > 0 : \ x(t) < x_1(t) \text{ for every } t \in (0, \tau)\} \tag{120}$$

We prove that $T = +\infty$. Assume $T < +\infty$, and let $R > b$ such that

$$x_2(t) < R, \quad \forall t \in (0, T) \tag{121}$$

which is possible by Lipschitz continuity of $x_2(.)$. Set

$$I(t) = \int_{x(t)}^{R} (\tilde{\rho}(t, x) - (\lambda + \varepsilon))^- dx, \quad J(t) = \int_{x_2(t)}^{R} (\tilde{\rho}(t, x) - (\lambda + \varepsilon))^- dx$$

The measures defined on $(0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ by

$$m^{\pm}(dt, dx) := \partial_t \phi^{\pm}_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x)) + \partial_x \psi^{\pm}_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x)) \tag{122}$$

where $(\phi_c^{\pm}, \psi_c^{\pm})$ is given by (18) with $h = f$, satisfy $m^+ = m^- \leq 0$, by (109) and (17) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$. By integration of (122),

$$\begin{aligned} I(T) - I(0) &= m\{(t,x) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R} : \, x \in [x(t), R]\} \\ &+ \int_0^T \left[\psi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x(t)^-)) - v\phi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x(t)^-))\right] dt \\ &- \int_0^T \psi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, R^+))dt \end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

$$\begin{aligned} J(T) - J(0) &= m\{(t,x) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R} : \, x \in [x_2(t), R]\} \\ &+ \int_0^T \left[\psi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x_2(t)^-)) - \dot{x}_2(t)\phi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x_2(t)^-))\right] dt \\ &- \int_0^T \psi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, R^+))dt \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

By (120),

$$\tilde{\rho}(t, x(t)^{\pm}) \leq \lambda + \varepsilon \tag{125}$$

for $t \in [0, T)$. (116), (118) and (125) imply

$$\psi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x(t)^-)) - v\phi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x(t)^-)) \geq 0 \tag{126}$$

By definition of $x_2(t)$,

$$\tilde{\rho}(t, x_2(t)^-) \geq \lambda + \varepsilon$$

which implies

$$\psi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x_2(t)^-)) - \dot{x}_2(t)\phi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, x_2(t)^-)) = 0 \tag{127}$$

Since $x(T) = x_1(T)$ by (120) and continuity of $x(.)$ and $x_1(.)$,

$$\begin{aligned} I(T) - I(0) &= \int_{x_2(T)}^R (\tilde{\rho}(t,x) - \lambda - \varepsilon)^- dx - \int_{a-\delta}^a (\tilde{\rho}_0(x) - \lambda - \varepsilon)^- dx - \int_b^R (\tilde{\rho}_0(x) - \lambda - \varepsilon)^- dx \\ &= J(T) - J(0) - \int_{a-\delta}^a (\tilde{\rho}_0(x) - (\lambda + \varepsilon))^- dx \leq -\Delta - \delta\varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

where $\Delta := \int_0^T \psi^-_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(\tilde{\rho}(t, R^+))dt$, and the inequality in (128) follows from (124), (127) and $m \leq 0$. Let

$$K(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\tilde{\rho}(t,x) - (\lambda + \varepsilon))^+ dx = \int_{a-Vt}^{b+Vt} (\tilde{\rho}(t,x) - (\lambda + \varepsilon))^+ dx$$

where the second equality follows from Proposition 5.1, which implies

$$\tilde{\rho}(t,x) = \lambda, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\backslash(a - Vt, b + Vt) \tag{129}$$

Integration of (122) combined with (129) yields

$$K(T) - K(0) = m\{(0,T) \times \mathbb{R}\} \tag{130}$$

Using (130), (119), (123), (126) and $m \leq 0$, we can contradict (128):

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta - \delta\varepsilon &< -\Delta + K(T) - K(0) = -\Delta + m\{(0,T) \times \mathbb{R}\} \\ &\leq -\Delta + m\left\{(t,x) \in (0,T) \times \mathbb{R} : x \in [x(t), R]\right\} \leq I(T) - I(0) \end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

5.3 The general case (22)

The following is an analogue of Lemma 5.3.

Lemma 5.4 *Let $\rho(.,.)$ be the entropy solution to (16) with uniform data $r \in \mathcal{R}$ in Ω and $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}$ on $\partial\Omega$, where $h'(\lambda).n \neq 0$. Then $\rho(t,.) \to \lambda$ as $t \to \infty$ in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$.*

Proof of lemma 5.4. Denote by $\rho_{a',b'}(t,x)$ the entropy solution to (16) in $\Omega^n_{a',b'}$ with uniform data r in $\Omega^n_{a',b'}$ and λ on $\partial\Omega^n_{a',b'}$. By Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3,

$$\rho_{a',b'}(t,.) \to \lambda, \quad \text{in } L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega^n_{a',b'}) \tag{132}$$

We consider the case $r \geq \lambda$, the case $r \leq \lambda$ being similar. By maximum principle (107),

$$\rho(t,.) \geq \lambda, \quad \rho_{a',b'}(t,.) \geq \lambda \tag{133}$$

for every $t > 0$. By (133) and Lemma 5.1 with $\rho = \rho_{a',b'}$, $\Omega_1 = \Omega^n_{a',b'}$, $\Omega_2 = \Omega$, $\Sigma = \emptyset$, $R^- = \lambda$, the restriction of $\rho_{a',b'}$ to $(0,+\infty) \times \Omega$ is an entropy super-solution to (16) in Ω for the uniform data r in Ω, λ on $\partial\Omega$. Thus, by Proposition 5.1, $\rho_{a',b'}(t,.) \geq \rho(t,.)$ in Ω for every $t > 0$. This, (133) and (132) imply the result. □

We now conclude the proof of Theorem 2.2 in the general case (22). We consider $\lambda_a \leq \lambda_b$, the reverse case being similar. We set $f(.) = h(.).n$. We denote by T_t the solution semigroup for (16) in Ω boundary datum $\hat{\lambda}(.)$; thus

$\rho(t,x) = T_t\rho_0(x)$. Proposition 5.1 implies that T_t is monotone. We consider sequences satisfying (111) and define, for $\gamma \in \{a,b\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the following entropy solutions to (16). ρ^γ has uniform initial datum λ_γ^f in Ω, and boundary datum $\hat{\lambda}(.)$ on $\partial\Omega$. $\tilde{\rho}^a$ has uniform initial datum λ_a^f in $\Omega_{a,b'}^n$; and boundary datum $\hat{\lambda}^a(.)$ on $\partial\Omega_{a,b'}^n$ equal to λ_a^f on $\{n.x = a\}$, λ_b on $\{n.x = b'\}$. $\tilde{\rho}^b$ has uniform initial datum λ_b^f in $\Omega_{a',b}^n$; and boundary datum $\hat{\lambda}^b(.)$ on $\partial\Omega_{a,b'}^n$ equal to λ_a on $\{n.x = a'\}$, λ_b^f on $\{n.x = b\}$. ρ_k^γ has initial datum $\rho_0(.)$ in Ω, and uniform boundary datum λ_γ^k on $\partial\Omega$. (113) still holds in the present setting by Proposition 5.1. By Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 5.2, for $\gamma \in \{a,b\}$,

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \rho^\gamma(t,.) = R_f(\lambda_a,\lambda_b), \quad \text{in } L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega_{a,b}^n) \tag{134}$$

By Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 5.1,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho_k^\gamma(t,.) = \lambda_\gamma^k \quad \text{in } L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \tag{135}$$

We claim that: (i) the restrictions of ρ^a and $\tilde{\rho}^a$ to $\Omega \cap \Omega_{a,b'}^n$ are respectively a super-solution and a sub-solution to (16) in $\Omega \cap \Omega_{a,b'}^n$ for the uniform initial datum λ_a^f, and boundary datum $\tilde{\lambda}^a(.)$ equal to λ_a^f on $\{n.x = a\}$ and λ_b on $\partial\Omega_b$; (ii) the restrictions of ρ^b and $\tilde{\rho}^b$ to $\Omega \cap \Omega_{a',b}^n$ are respectively a sub-solution and a super-solution to (16) in $\Omega \cap \Omega_{a',b}^n$ for the uniform initial datum λ_b^f, and boundary datum $\tilde{\lambda}^b(.)$ equal to λ_a on $\partial\Omega_a$ and λ_b^f on $\{n.x = b\}$. Indeed: first note that, by maximum principle (107),

$$\lambda_a^f \le \min(\rho^a(t,.),\, \tilde{\rho}^a(t,.)) \le \max(\rho^a(t,.),\, \tilde{\rho}^a(t,.)) \le \lambda_b \tag{136}$$

for every $t > 0$ on $\Omega \cap \Omega_{a,b'}^n$. Then apply Lemma 5.1: (a) to ρ, with $\Omega_1 = \Omega$, $\Omega_2 = \Omega \cap \Omega_{a,b'}^n$, $\Sigma = \partial\Omega_b$, $\partial\Omega_2\backslash\Sigma = \{n.x = a\}$, $R^- = \lambda_a^f$; (b) to $\rho_{a,b'}$ with $\Omega_1 = \Omega_{a,b'}^n$, $\Omega_2 = \Omega \cap \Omega_{a,b'}^n$, $\Sigma = \{n.x = a\}$, $\partial\Omega_2\backslash\Sigma = \partial\Omega_b$, $R^+ = \lambda_b$. This establishes (i),(ii) being similar. By Proposition 5.1, for $\gamma \in \{a,b\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_{a,b}^n \cap B\delta(x_0)} (\rho(t,x) - \tilde{\rho}^\gamma(s,x))^{\sigma_\gamma} \le \int_{\Omega_{a,b}^n \cap B_\delta(x_0)} (T_s\rho_\gamma^k(t-s,x) - \tilde{\rho}^\gamma(s,x))^{\sigma_\gamma} dx \\
\le\ &\int_{\Omega_{a,b}^n \cap B_\delta(x_0)} (T_s\rho_\gamma^k(t-s,x) - T_s\lambda_f^\gamma)^{\sigma_\gamma} dx + \int_{\Omega_{a,b}^n \cap B_\delta(x_0)} (T_s\lambda_\gamma^f - \tilde{\rho}^\gamma(s,x))^{\sigma_\gamma} dx \\
\le\ &\int_{\Omega_{a,b}^n \cap B_\delta(x_0+Vs)} (\rho_\gamma^k(t-s,x) - \lambda_f^\gamma)^{\sigma_\gamma} dx
\end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

where $0 < s < t$, $\sigma_a = -$, $\sigma_b = +$, $B_\delta(x_0) \subset \Omega$. In (137), the first inequality follows from (113) and monotonicity of T_s. The first term on the second line is bounded by the third line by Proposition 5.1. The second term on the second line, where $T_s\lambda^f_\gamma = \rho^\gamma(s,.)$, is zero by Proposition 5.1 and the above claims (i), (ii). The result follows by $\lim_{k\to\infty} \limsup_{s\to\infty} \limsup_{t\to\infty}$ in (137) and (134)–(135)

A Proofs of some PDE results

A.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

We may assume in (17) that

$$M \geq \sup\{|h'(r)| : 0 \leq r \leq ||\rho||_\infty\} \tag{138}$$

Let $(\phi^\pm, \psi^\pm) = (\phi^\pm_c, \psi^\pm_c)$. By (17), a nonpositive measure is defined by

$$m^\pm(dt, dx) := \partial_t \phi^\pm(\rho) + \nabla_x . \psi^\pm(\rho)$$

on $(0, +\infty) \times \Omega_1$. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an open subset of Ω_1 with a boundary of locally finite perimeter. By [12, 14], there is an inner normal trace $\hat{\psi}^\pm_{\mathcal{O}}(t,x)$ on $(0,+\infty) \times \partial\mathcal{O}$ for $\psi^\pm(\rho(t,x))$, that satisfies Green's formula

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathcal{O}}(\varphi) &:= \int_{(0,+\infty)\times\mathcal{O}} [\phi^\pm(\rho(t,x))\partial_t\varphi(t,x) + \psi^\pm(\rho(t,x)).\nabla_x\varphi(t,x)]dtdx \\ = & -\int_{(0,+\infty)\times\mathcal{O}} \varphi(t,x) m^\pm(dt,dx) - \int_{(0,+\infty)\times\partial\mathcal{O}} \varphi(t,x)\hat{\psi}^\pm_{\mathcal{O}}(t,x)dt\, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ & - \int_{\mathcal{O}} \varphi(0,x)\phi^\pm(\rho_0(x))dx \end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

for every smooth $\varphi \geq 0$ with compact support in $[0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$. For $\mathcal{O} = \Omega_1$, with (17) and φ supported in $(0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we obtain

$$\hat{\psi}^\pm_{\Omega_1}(t,x) \leq M\phi^\pm(\hat{\lambda}(x)) \tag{140}$$

Then, with $\mathcal{O} = \Omega_2$ in (139),

$$\begin{aligned} & I_{\Omega_2}(\varphi) + \int_{\Omega_2} \varphi(0,x)\phi^{\pm}(\rho_0(x))dx + M\int_{(0,+\infty)\times\partial\Omega_2} \varphi(t,x)\phi^{\pm}(\hat{\lambda}^{\pm}(x))dt\, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ \geq & \int_{(0,+\infty)\times\Sigma} \left[M\phi^{\pm}(\hat{\lambda}(x)) - \hat{\psi}^{\pm}_{\Omega_2}(t,x)\right] dt\, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \\ + & \int_{(0,+\infty)\times(\partial\Omega_2-\Sigma)} \left[M\phi^{\pm}(R^{\pm}) - \hat{\psi}^{\pm}_{\Omega_2}(t,x)\right] dt\, d\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(x) \end{aligned} \tag{141}$$

The second line of (141) is nonnnegative because of (140), since $\hat{\psi}^{\pm}_{\Omega_1} = \hat{\psi}^{\pm}_{\Omega_2}$ a.e. on $(0,+\infty)\times(\partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega_2)$. For a.e. $(t,x) \in (0,+\infty)\times\Omega_2$ and any unitary vector $n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $R^- \leq \rho(t,x) \leq R^+$ and (138) imply

$$\psi^{\pm}(\rho(t,x)).n \leq M\phi^{\pm}(\rho(t,x)) \leq M\phi^{\pm}(R^{\pm}) \tag{142}$$

Thus $\hat{\psi}^{\pm}_{\Omega_2}(t,x) \leq M\phi^{\pm}(R^{\pm})$ a.e. on $(0,+\infty)\times\partial\Omega_2$, whence the result.

A.2 Sign changes for entropy solutions

Proposition A.1 *Let $c \in \mathcal{R}$, and ρ be an entropy solution to (109) on $\mathbb{R}$ with initial datum $\rho_0(.)$. Assume there exist*

$$-\infty = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_n < +\infty = x_{n+1} \tag{143}$$

such that on (x_{i-1}, x_i), $\rho_0 \leq c$ for odd i and $\rho_0 \geq c$ for even i. Then there exist trajectories $t \geq 0 \mapsto x_i(t)$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n+1$ such that:

(i) $-\infty = x_0(t) < x_1(t) \leq \cdots \leq x_n(t) < x_{n+1}(t) = +\infty$
(ii) $x_i(0) = x_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$
(iii) $x_i(.)$ is Lipschitz-continuous for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
(iv) On (x_{i-1}, x_i) we have $\rho(t,.) \leq c$ for odd i and $\rho(t,.) \geq c$ for even i.
(v) If $x_i(t) = x_{i+1}(t)$ for some $t > 0$, then $x_i(s) = x_{i+1}(s)$ for all $s > t$.

We use Godunov's scheme (see e.g. [30]) to prove the result for $n = 1$, then extend it to larger n by finite propagation property. Let $\Delta t > 0$ and $\Delta x = \varepsilon > 0$ satisfy the CFL condition (see [30]):

$$\lambda := \Delta t/\Delta x \leq 1/(2V), \quad V = \sup\left\{|h'(\rho)| : 0 \leq \rho \leq ||\rho_0||_{\infty} \vee c\right\} \tag{144}$$

For $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup (\mathbb{N} + 1/2)$, define $\rho_j(.) = \rho^{\varepsilon}_j(.)$ as follows. $\rho_0(.)$ is the exact initial datum. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, on each interval $(k\Delta x, (k+1)\Delta x)$, $\rho_{j+1/2}(.)$ is equal to

the mean value $\rho_{j,k}$ of $\rho_j(.)$ on this interval. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, ρ_{j+1} is the entropy solution to (109) at time Δt with initial datum $\rho_{j+1/2}$. By (144) and Proposition 5.1, ρ_{j+1} is a superposition of the noninteracting Cauchy problems with data $\rho_{j,k-1}1_{(-\infty,k\Delta x)} + \rho_{j,k}1_{(k\Delta x,+\infty)}$ (Riemann problems).

Step one: $n = 1$. We construct a trajectory $j \mapsto y_1(j) = y_1^\varepsilon(j)$, where $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup (\mathbb{N}+1/2)$, such that: (ii') $y_1^\varepsilon(0) = x_1$; (iii') $|y_1(j+1/2) - y_1(j)| \leq \Delta x$; (iv') $\rho_j(.) \leq c$ on $(-\infty, y_1(j))$ and $\rho_j(.) \geq c$ on $(y_1(j), +\infty)$. We then define $x_1^\varepsilon(t) = y_1^\varepsilon([t/\Delta t])$. By (iii') and (144), $x_1^\varepsilon(.)$ converges uniformly to a Lipschitz-continuous $x_1(.)$. $\rho^\varepsilon_{[t/\Delta t]}(.)$ converges (see [30]) to $\rho(t,.)$ in $L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R})$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This and (iv') imply (iv).

We now construct $y_1(j)$. We set $y_1(0) = x_1$. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = [y_1(j)/\Delta x]$. Assume $y_1(j)$ satisfies (iv'). We set $y_1(j+1/2) = k\Delta x$ if $\rho_{j,k} > c$, $= (k+1)\Delta x$ if $\rho_{j,k} < c$, or of these values if $\rho_{j,k} = c$. Then (iii')-(iv') hold. Assume $y_1(j+1/2) = k\Delta x$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and

$$\rho_{j,k} \leq c \text{ for } j < k, \quad \rho_{j,k} \geq c \text{ for } j \geq k \tag{145}$$

Let $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. By construction of the Riemann problem (see e.g. [30]), on $((l-1)\Delta x + V\Delta t, (l+1)\Delta x - V\Delta t)$, $\rho_{j+1}(.)$ is a monotone function, with constant value $\rho_{j,l-1}$ on $((l-1)\Delta x + Vt, l\Delta x - Vt)$ and constant value $\rho_{j,l}$ on $(l\Delta x + Vt, (l+1)\Delta x - Vt)$. This and (145) imply that:

(a) For $l < k$, we have $\rho_{j+1}(.) \leq c$ on $((l-1)\Delta x + V\Delta t, (l+1)\Delta x - V\Delta t)$
(b) For $l > k$, we have $\rho_{j+1}(.) \geq c$ on $((l-1)\Delta x + V\Delta t, (l+1)\Delta x - V\Delta t)$
(c) For $l = k$, there exists $y \in (k\Delta x - Vt, k\Delta x + Vt)$ such that $\rho_{j+1}(.) \leq c$ on $((k-1)\Delta x + Vt, y)$ and $\rho_{j+1}(.) \geq c$ on $(y, (k+1)\Delta x - Vt)$

We set $y_1(j+1) := y$ in (c) above. (a)-(c) and (144) imply (iii')-(iv').

Step two. We prove the result for $n > 1$ on $[0, T)$ with $T > 0$. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, set

$$\rho_0^i = \rho_0 \mathbf{1}_{(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})} + c\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})}$$

Let $\rho^i(t,x)$ be the entropy solution to (109) with initial datum ρ_0^i. ρ_0^i satisfies the assumptions of the proposition for $n = 1$ with a single initial interface at x_i (modulo the symmetry $x \mapsto -x$ for even i, which changes f in (109) into

$-f$). For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we obtain a Lipschitz trajectory $t > 0 \mapsto x_i(t)$ such that (a) $x_i(0) = x_i$; (b) for odd i, $\rho^i(.) \leq c$ on $(-\infty, x_i(t))$ and $\rho^i(.) \geq c$ on $(x_i(t), +\infty)$; (c) for even i, $\rho^i(.) \geq c$ on $(-\infty, x_i(t))$ and $\rho^i(.) \leq c$ on $(x_i(t), +\infty)$ By Proposition 5.1,

$$\rho^i(t, .) = \rho(t, .) \text{ on } (x_{i-1} + Vt, x_{i+1} - Vt) \tag{146}$$

By (b)-(c) above, (146) and Lipschitz continuity of $x_i(.)$, there exists $T > 0$ such that $x_i(t) < x_{i+1}(t)$ and (iv) of the proposition holds for $t < T$.

Step three: conclusion. Let $T^* > 0$ be the supremum of $\tau > 0$ such that the proposition holds on $[0, \tau)$. Then it holds on $[0, T^*]$. Suppose $T^* < +\infty$. Partition $\{0, \ldots, n+1\}$ into maximal subsets $I_0, \ldots, I_{m+1}$, where $1 \leq m \leq n$, such that (i) $\max I_k < \min I_{k+1}$ for each $k = 0, \ldots, m$; (ii) $x_i(T^*)$ has constant value (denoted by y_k) on each I_k. Note that $I_0 = \{0\}$ and $I_{m+1} = \{n+1\}$. Thus

$$-\infty = y_0 < y_1 < \ldots < y_m < y_{m+1} = +\infty$$

satisfy the assumptions of the proposition for initial datum $\rho(T^*, .)$. By step two, for some $T^{**} > 0$, the result holds on $[0, T^{**})$ with trajectories $y_i(.)$ (for $i = 0, \ldots, m+1$), initial sequence $(y_i,\ i = 0, \ldots, m+1)$ and initial datum $\rho(T^*, .)$. Let $x_i(t) = y_k(t)$ for $i \in I_k$ for $T^* < t < T^* + T^{**}$. By semigroup property the result still holds on $[0, T^* + T^{**})$ for the sequence $(x_i,\ i = 0, \ldots, n+1)$ and datum $\rho_0(.)$: a contradiction.

Acknowledgements. I thank J.L. Lebowitz, R. Marra, R. Esposito, and organizers of the 2004 Oberwolfach workshop "Large scale stochastic dynamics" for invitations to present this project. I also thank T. Bodineau, S. Grosskinsky, G. Schütz and E.R. Speer for stimulating discussions.

References

[1] Andjel, E.D.: Invariant measures for the zero-range process. Ann. Probab. **10**, 525–547 (1982)

[2] Bahadoran, C.: Hydrodynamics of asymmetric particle systems with open boundaries. Oberwolfach Reports **43**, 64–67 (2004)

[3] Bahadoran, C.: Blockage hydrodynamics of driven conservative systems. *Ann. Probab.* **32** no. 1B, 805–854 (2004)

[4] Bahadoran, C., Guiol, H., Ravishankhar, K., Saada, E.: A constructive approach to Euler hydrodynamics for attractive particle systems. Application to k-step exclusion. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **99** no. 1, 1–30 (2002)

[5] Bahadoran, C., Guiol, H., Ravishankhar, K., Saada, E.: Euler hydrodynamics of one-dimensional attractive particle systems. *Ann. Probab.* **34**, 1339–1369 (2006)

[6] Bahadoran, C., Speer, E.R.: Work in progress.

[7] Bardos, C., Leroux, A.Y, Nédélec, J.C.: First order quasilinear equations with boundary conditions. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **4**, 1017–1034 (1979)

[8] Benilan, P., Kružkov, S.: Conservation laws with continuous flux functions. Nonlinear Diff. Equat. Appl. **3**, 395–419 (1996)

[9] Benois, O., Esposito, R., Marra, R., Mourragui, M.: Hydrodynamics of a driven lattice gas with open boundaries: the asymmetric simple exclusion. Markov Processes and Related Fields **10**, 89–112 (2004)

[10] Bénilan, P., Kružkov, S.: Conservation laws with continuous flux functions.

[11] Braides, A.: A short introduction to Young measures. SISSA, 1999/2000.

[12] Chen, G.Q, Frid, H.: Divergence-Measure fields and hyperbolic conservation laws. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **147**, 89118 (1999)

[13] Chen, G.Q., Rascle, M.: Initial Layers and Uniqueness of weak Entropy Solutions to hyperbolic Conservation Laws. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **153**, 205–220 (2000)

[14] Chen, G.Q., Torres, M.: Divergence-Measure Fields, Sets of Finite Perimeter, and Conservation Laws. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **175**, 245–267 (2005)

[15] Cocozza, C.: Processus des misanthropes. Z. Wahr. Verw. Gebiete **70**, 509–523

[16] Derrida, B., Evans, M.R., Hakim, V., Pasquier, V.: Exact solution of a 1D asymmetric exclusion model using a matrix formulation. J. Phys. A. **26**, 1493-1517 (1993)

[17] Di perna, R.: Measure-valued solutions to conservation laws. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal (1984)

[18] De Giorgi, E.: Su una teoria generale della misura (r-1) dimensionale in uno spazio ad r dimensioni. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **4**, 191–213 (1954)

[19] Dubois, F., Le Floch, P.: Boundary conditions for nonlinear hyperbolic systems of conservations laws. J. Diff. Equa **71**, 93–122 (1988)

[20] Durrett, R.: Ten lectures on particle systems. Lect. Notes in Mathematics 1581. Springer (1994)

[21] Guiol, H.: Some properties of k-step exclusion process. J. Stat. Phys. **94**, 495-511 (1999)

[22] Eyink, G., Lebowitz, J., Spohn, H.: Hydrodynamics of stationary nonequilibrium states for some stochastic lattice gas models. Comm. Math. Phys. **132**, no. 1 (1990), 253283

[23] Eyink, G., Lebowitz, J., Spohn, H.: Lattice gas models in contact with stochastic reservoirs: local equilibrium and relaxation to the steady state. Comm. Math. Phys. **140**, no. 1 (1991), 119131

[24] Eymard, R., Gallouët, Herbin, R. Existence and uniqueness of the entropy solution to a nonlinear hyperbolic equation". Chin. Ann. of Math. **16B**, p. 1–14 (1995)

[25] Fritz, J.: An Introduction to the Theory of Hydrodynamic Limits. Lectures in Mathematical Sciences 18. The University of Tokyo, ISSN 09198180, Tokyo 2001.

[26] Fritz, J.: Entropy pairs and compensated compactness for weakly asymmetric systems. Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics **39**, 143–171 (2004)

[27] Fritz, J., Toth, B.: Derivation of the Leroux system as the hydrodynamic limit of a two-component lattice gas with large microscopic viscosity. Comm. Math. Phys. **249**, 127 (2004)

[28] Fritz, J., Nagy, K.: On uniqueness of the Euler limit for one-component lattice gas models. Preprint.

[29] Gallouët, T., Herbin, R.: A uniqueness result for measure-valued solutions to nonlinear hyperbolic equations. Diff. Int. Equations, **6** 1383–1394 (1993)

[30] Godelwski, E., Raviart, P.: Hyperbolic systems of conservations laws. Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer-Verlag, 1995

[31] Grosskinski, S.: Phase transitions in nonequibrium stochastic particle systems with local conservation laws. PHD Thesis, University of Munich (2004)

[32] Guiol, H.: Some properties of k-step exclusion process. J. Stat. Phys. **94**, 495–511 (1999)

[33] Harris, T.E. Nearest neighbor Markov interaction processes on multidimensional lattices. *Adv. in Math.* **9** (1972), 66–89.

[34] Harris, T.E. Additive set-valued Markov processes and graphical methods. *Ann. Probab.* **6** (1978), 355–378.

[35] Joseph, K.T., Veerappa Gowda, G.D.: Explicit formula for the solution of convex conservation laws with boundary conditions. Duke Mathematical Journal **62**, 401–416 (1991)

[36] Kipnis, C., Landim, C.: Scaling limits of infinite particle systems. Springer (1999)

[37] Kipnis, C., Landim, C., Olla, S.: Macroscopic properties of a stationary non-equilibrium distribution for a non-gradient interacting particle system Annales de l'Institut H. Poincar, Prob. et Stat. **31**, 191-221 (1995)

[38] Katz, S., Lebowitz, J. L., Spohn, H.: Stationary nonequilibrium states for stochastic lattice gas models of ionic superconductors. J. Statist. Phys. **34**, 497537 (1984)

[39] Kružkov, N.: First order quasilinear equations in several independant variables. Math. USSR Sb. **10**, 217–243 (1970)

[40] Kwon, Y-S, Vasseur, A.: Strong traces for solutions to scalar conservation laws with general flux. Preprint

[41] Harris, T. E. Additive set-valued Markov processes and graphical methods. Ann. Probab. **6**, 355–378 (1978)

[42] Kovchegov, Y.: Exclusion processes with multiple interactions. Preprint, arXiv:math.PR/0407005

[43] Lax, P.D.: Hyperbolic systems of conservation laws II. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **10**, 537–566 (1957)

[44] Liggett, T.M.: Liggett, T.M. *Interacting particle systems.* Classics in Mathematics (Reprint of first edition), Springer-Verlag, New York, (2005)

[45] Liggett, T.M.: Ergodic theorems for the asymmetric simple exclusion process 1. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **213**, 237–261 (1975)

[46] Liggett, T.M.: Ergodic theorems for the asymmetric simple exclusion process 2. Ann. Probab. **5**, 795–801 (1977)

[47] Liggett, T.M.: Coupling the simple exclusion process. Ann. Probab. **4**, 339–356 (1976)

[48] Landim, C., Mourragui, M., Sellami, S.: Hydrodynamic limit of nongradient systems in contact with stochastic reservoirs. Theory of Probability and Mathematical Statisitics **45**, 694-717 (2000)

[49] Liu, H., Pan, T.: Interaction of elementary waves for scalar conservation laws on a bounded domain. Math. Meth. Appl. Sci. **26**, 619-632 (2003)

[50] Martin, S., Vovelle, J.: Large-time behaviour of the entropy solution of a scalar conservation law with boundary conditions. Quart. Appl. Math. **65**, 425-450 (2007)

[51] Otto, F.: Initial-boundary value problem for a scalar conservation law. C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris **322**, 729–734 (1996)

[52] Panov, E.Y.: Existence of strong traces for generalized solutions of multidimensional scalar conservation laws. Journal of Hyperbolic Differential Equations **2**, 885908 (2005)

[53] Panov, E.Y.: Existence of strong traces for quasi-solutions of multidimensional scalar conservation laws. Preprint

[54] Popkov, V., Schütz, G. (1999): Steady state selection in driven diffusive systems with open boundaries. Europhys. Lett. 48, 257–263 (1999)

[55] Rezakhanlou, F.: Hydrodynamic limit for attractive particle systems on $\mathbf{Z}^d$. Commun. Math. Phys. **140**, 417–448 (1991)

[56] Rezakhanlou, F.: Continuum limit for some growth models. II. Ann. Probab **29**, 1329–1372 (2001)

[57] Serre, D.: Systems of conservation laws. Translated from the 1996 French original by I. N. Sneddon. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[58] Seppäläinen, T.: Existence of hydrodynamics for the totally asymmetric simple K-exclusion process. Ann. Probab. **27**, 361-415 (1999)

[59] Strassen, V. The existence of probability measures with given marginals. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **36** (1965), 423–439.

[60] Szepessy A.: An existence result for scalar conservation laws using measure valued solutions. Comm. Partial Diff. Eqs. **24**, 1329-1350 (1989)

[61] Szepessy A.: Measure-valued solutions to conservation laws with boundary conditions. Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal, 181–193 (1989)

[62] Vasseur, A.: Strong traces for solutions of multidimensional scalar conservation laws. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **160**, 181–193 (2001)

[63] Vol'pert, A.I.: The spaces BV and quasilinear equations. Math. USSR Sbornik **2**, 225–266 (1967)

[64] Vovelle, J.: Convergence of finite volume monotone schemes for scalar conservation laws on bounded domains. Numerische Mathematik **90**, 563-596 (2002)